

Some of your most rewarding experiences, by the way, will be the explorations you can make on foot, away from roads and beaten paths.

Hopefully, your visits will inspire you, as it has us at Sunset, to support the addition of more such worthwhile areas. To meet the expanding needs for human enrichment in the next century of parks, millions of Americans and their government representatives must make an all-out commitment to work together for more parks and wilderness areas.

And, if, perchance, you find yourself where it all began at Yellowstone, just quietly tip your hat to the same patriarchal geyser John Colter saw, and say, "Happy Birthday, Old Faithful."

WHY IS SUNSET SO INTERESTED?

Sunset Magazine and Books are part and parcel of Western America, where, by good fortune, nature has located a vast number of the most spectacular areas in the National Park System.

From Alaska's Mount McKinley to New Mexico's Carlsbad Caverns, Colorado's Rocky Mountain to Hawaii's Haleakala, we Westerners are blessed with an abundance of National Parks.

Because travel and exploration are important aspects of Sunset's service to its readers, our editors have become recognized authorities on the lore of National Park areas in Western America.

This goes back to 1898, when the maiden

issue of Sunset Magazine had a National Park, Yosemite, as its feature article.

Since then, literally thousands of pages in Sunset publications have been devoted to helping people derive enjoyment from their National Park experiences.

Why is Sunset so interested? Because we believe that the existence and influence of National Parks are among the most precious of American legacies—and that the dedicated people of the National Park Service make a matchless contribution to world communion.

That is why we invite you to share in cherishing, preserving, and enjoying these wonderful manifestations of man's best wisdom.

And why we have sponsored this anniversary day message.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 23, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.—Psalms 124: 8.

Our Father God, who art the life within our souls, the law within our minds, and the love which warms our hearts, direct us with Thy most gracious favor and further us with Thy continual help that this day may be a great day because Thou art with us and we are with Thee.

In the haste and hurry of a swiftly moving age may we be strengthened by Thy spirit to live by the light of love, to walk in wise ways and to serve our country faithfully with high honor.

Most heartily do we pray that Thou wilt bless our President, our Speaker, and Members of Congress. Grant unto them courage, faith, and wisdom, and so rule their hearts and direct their endeavors that justice, peace, and good will may everywhere begin to prevail: To the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1426. An act to establish the Van Buren Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes;

S. 3129. An act to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes; and

S. 3166. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, appointed Mr. HATFIELD as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy in lieu of Mr. YOUNG, excused.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, not only do I want to thank all of you and all of the Senate for this day, making it possible for women to be considered as human beings under the Constitution, but also I wear these flowers today to celebrate the fact that Hawaii is the first State to ratify the equal rights amendment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Abourezk	Eckardt	Murphy, N.Y.
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Foley	Pelly
Ashley	Ford	Pryor, Ark.
Badillo	William D.	Fucinski
Baring	Forsythe	Rangel
Belcher	Fulton	Rees
Brooks	Fuqua	Riegle
Buchanan	Gallfanakis	Rosenthal
Camp	Gallagher	Rostenkowski
Carey, N.Y.	Gaydos	Saylor
Celler	Gray	Scheuer
Chamberlain	Hagan	Shoup
Chappell	Halpern	Springer
Chisholm	Hastings	Staggers
Clark	Hawkins	Stanton
Clay	Hébert	James V.
Collins, Ill.	Hull	Stokes
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Kemp	Teague, Tex.
Dellums	Kyros	Wampler
Dent	Landrum	Yates
Diggs	McKinney	Yatron
Dorn	Metcalfe	Zablocki
Dowdy	Mikva	
Dwyer	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FORTY-FOUR DAYS AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, 44 days ago our esteemed colleague and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, wrote to President Nixon requesting him to submit to the Congress a plan for tax reform. The chairman asked that the President submit his proposals by March 15 in order for Congress to have time to act on them in this session. It is March 23, and nothing has emerged from the Nixon administration except silence.

Perhaps this silence is an indication that the administration believes the issue of income tax reform is a passing fad, drummed up by the media. It is not. When it is public knowledge that because of special tax loopholes more than 1,300 people with incomes in excess of \$50,000 paid no taxes in 1970, the issue of tax reform will not go away. When the public knows that because of the oil depletion allowance, our 19 largest oil corporations pay a smaller percentage of their combined net earnings in taxes—less than 9 percent of \$9 billion in 1970—than the worker who earns \$9,000 a year, the issue of tax reform will not go away. When our largest steel firm, with net earnings of \$154 million, can boast in a report to

its stockholders that it paid no Federal income tax in 1971—the issue of tax reform will not go away.

Private and corporate tax loopholes make a mockery of the progressive principles on which the Federal income tax was originally based. They shift the burden of the cost of Government from those who are best able to bear it onto others who are not. Tax loopholes also deprive the Government of billions of dollars in revenue every year. These funds are lost to the public at a time when they are desperately needed for domestic social programs. If we are going to restore equity to our tax laws and faith in our Government, tax reform is an urgent necessity.

We have asked the President to make his proposals—to offer the Nation responsible leadership on the question of income tax reform. To date he has given no indication that he intends to take any action.

The deadline for the expiration of the Federal debt ceiling increase is June 30. The Congress cannot in good conscience approve another debt increase without meaningful action toward raising additional revenue. The only fair way to do this is income tax reform.

We cannot wait much longer for the President to act.

RELEASED TIME FOR REGISTRATION

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group of Members of Congress is sponsoring a young-voter registration program we call "Released Time for Registration."

The purpose of this program is to encourage high schools to make voter registration an official school activity for 18-year-old students. Now that the 26th amendment has enabled all 18-year-olds to vote, it seems most highly desirable that they do so. After all, they are the ones who are going to have to live with national policy the longest; in that sense they have the largest stake in the future of our country.

Sponsors of the program are Republicans DELLENBACK, QUIE, WHALEN, FINDLEY, MOSHER, BELL, and Minority Leader JERRY FORD working with Democrats RICH PREYER, JOHNSON of California, ANNUNZIO, DRINAN, UDALL, BOGGS, and LEGGETT.

We are urging all our colleagues to contact the high school principals in their district, informing them of the deadline for registration to vote in this year's primary election. We urge that registration be made an official school activity.

Principals can follow the example of Jeb Stuart High School in nearby Fairfax, Va., by busing all 18-year-olds to the county seat for registration.

They can release students from class to go and register on an individual or class basis.

Or they can bring registrars right into the school.

In any case, we must act quickly.

Young people need to have a symbolic and substantive voice in running the country. I urge all my colleagues to write not only to their high school principals but to their local NEA chapters, school boards, League of Women Voters, student vote organizations, et cetera, urging immediate action. All of these groups are already working on this project nationally.

STATE PRESIDENTIAL-PREFERENTIAL PRIMARIES

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill that would require all State presidential-preferential primaries to be held on the same day. Twenty-five of these primaries are scheduled this year—up from 14 in 1968—and they are stretched out over several months.

This system of multiple primaries leaves candidates broke and exhausted and leaves the public confused, tired, and sick from an overdose of politics.

The present system places too much emphasis on the results of one State which may or may not represent a valid cross-section of American opinion.

I agree with Senator MANSFIELD that the present system is a "political circus or road show" and that it is not fair to the candidates or the voters. For the underfinanced candidate, this system is fatal.

I am not convinced that presidential-preferential primaries should be held at all, especially under the present system when in many cases delegates are not bound to support the winner.

But, if we are going to conduct these primaries, they should all be held on the same day and many of the evils in the present system would be removed.

HAWAII FIRST IN EQUAL RIGHTS

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as Hawaii's Representative to Congress and cosponsor of the equal rights amendment I take pride in coming to the well today to announce that the 50th and youngest State of the Union has paved the way to ratify the amendment and granting equal rights to women. The Hawaii State Legislature has distinguished itself by becoming the first to ratify the constitutional amendment adopted by the Congress. This the Hawaii Legislature did within 2 hours after the Senate approved the House initiated legislation.

I do hope that a minimum of 75 percent of the other States will follow the leadership of their youngest sister State. May the pure child take them by their hand.

REPEAL ELECTION REFORM

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress enacted the so-called Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971—and I voted for it—there has been nothing but confusion and a galaxy of contrary interpretations.

In fact, certain liberal newspapers, in their zeal to promote their reform kick, have in large measure been responsible for the enactment of this legislative atrocity.

I have long favored a revision of election laws to limit amounts contributed as well as to be expended and have sponsored and cosponsored bills to eliminate the inequities. But under this new law, labor union leaders can still pour millions into buying their own handpicked candidates, and the little fellow with limited means is really not protected.

Further, the reporting requirements, and complicated administrative details are so complex and burdensome that one can hardly be a candidate without risking the possibility of going to jail.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Congress is unhappy about what it has done, and upon close examination of the fine print in the law, many feel we should fall back and start over again.

We recognize some of the press will scream in righteous indignation, but the old law is much better than the bad new one. Since Congress was somewhat stumped into enacting election reform, I am proposing a simple repealer; if adopted, we can then systematically legislate a reasonable election reform bill, under normal conditions, and pass a good law without being under the gun of an impending general election.

I trust my colleagues will join me in this course of action.

ARE MEAT PRICES OUT OF LINE?

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the over-the-counter prices of meat are causing a great deal of concern throughout our country. Some of our big chain stores are urging their customers to substitute other products for meat and some of the Members of the House of Representatives have authored legislation to eliminate quotas on meat imports.

I wonder if any of these people have ever taken a look at what has happened to our food dollar in the past 20 years?

Twenty years ago, the average consumer spent \$896 per year for food.

Of that amount, \$448 went to the producer and \$448 went to the middleman. The producer got 50 percent of the food dollar and the middleman 50 percent.

Today, the average expenditure is \$1,224.

Of that total, the producer now gets only \$447, a dollar less than he got 20 years ago, but the middleman's share has increased to \$767.

The middleman now gets 62 percent of the food dollar and the producer only 38 percent.

In the past 20 years, farm income has

increased only 7 percent, but the average wage earner's salary has increased 340 percent, business and professional incomes have increased 200 percent and corporation dividends 300 percent. The producer of meat at the farm level is receiving less than he did 20 years ago.

It is easy to see that the producer is still at the bottom of the economic ladder and that meat, at the producer level, is still a great bargain in view of the income increases of the rest of our people.

CONDUCT OF U.S. OFFICIALS OVERSEAS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have read with considerable interest reports that certain members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would like to initiate an inquiry into the alleged behavior of Ambassador Arthur Watson on a recent flight from Paris to Washington. I commend them for wanting to look into this matter. It seems to me that the department of officials who represent this country overseas may well be a legitimate area of public interest and should be thoroughly examined by the Congress. But in our interest to look into one highly publicized affair, we should not avoid looking into others which may have been equally damaging. Accordingly, if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee thinks the allegations about Mr. Watson are worth examining, in the interest of equity, I will have to ask the State Department to make available to me their files on other American officials who travel or work overseas. The reports about Ambassador Watson are not the only reports available on the department of American officials overseas. The State Department keeps files on Congressmen, Senators, and other public officials as well. If Ambassador Watson's behavior is worth examining, so is their behavior. All American officials—whether they are Ambassadors or not—represent the United States when they are traveling in foreign countries. If the Senate Foreign Relations Committee thinks it is their duty to begin looking into this area, I think we have to look into it thoroughly.

GRADE SCHOOL CHILDREN TO MARCH

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday word reached a number of us in the House that a few left-wing radical leaders associated with the District school system were planning a street march using grade school children to exploit their own political bankruptcy.

The news was too degrading to believe—but I call to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that this bizarre event is actually scheduled for Saturday in the streets of the Nation's Capital.

It is an all-time low in cheap, callous, cradle-snatching cruelty and I urge as strongly as I can that this body of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, rise as one to condemn the politically depraved that have planned it.

I sent a telegram this morning to Mayor Walter Washington urging that he condemn this pitiful parading of schoolchildren for the purpose of massaging the egos of a few disgruntled and disgusting so-called community leaders who exploit children in frustration over their own political failures. I urge the Mayor to withdraw permits. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of the House make known their anger to Mayor Washington by calling or sending telegrams demanding an end to endangering the minds and lives of our District grade school students by dragging them into the hazards of our streets as helpless pawns of political madness.

FEBRUARY RISE IN INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT

(Mr. COLLIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the dispensers of gloom and doom on the state of our economy in recent months will, I am sure, be pleased to know that the February rise in industrial output of 0.7 percent was the largest rise since last September.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Federal Reserve Board released the industrial output figures for the month of February, 1972. The February rise in industrial output of 0.7 percent, seasonally adjusted, was the largest rise since last September. This rise in production is encouraging not only because of its large size, but because it is a continuation of an upward trend in industrial production which started last September, after President Nixon's new economic program was inaugurated.

Additionally, the February gain was broadly based. From January to February the index of production of consumer goods rose from 118.3 to 119 percent of the 1967 base period, business equipment production grew from 97.6 to 98.3 percent and materials production rose from 108.4 to 109.7 percent.

By industry grouping, the performance was also strong. Manufacturing production rose in February from 106.4 to 107.2 percent, durable goods production from 99.4 to 100.4 percent and nondurable goods production from 116.5 to 117.1 percent.

The high output of household appliances, carpeting, and furniture during February is especially good news, because it indicates that strengthening consumer confidence in the economy is being reflected in rising purchases. This news concerning industrial production, when combined with the reports we have had in the past month of growing strength in business plans to invest in new plants and equipment during January, and business expectations regarding sales and inventory investment during the first quarter of 1972, is further

evidence that we are engaged in a strong, broadly based economic expansion.

THREE MEMBERS OF PAY BOARD RESIGN

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday three members of the Pay Board resigned, claiming that they had been the victims of "flagrant favoritism." I do not propose to say who has been right or wrong in past Pay Board decisions because I have not been privy to the considerations of the Board. But I must express my concern and even criticism of any member of the Pay Board, whether management, public, or labor, who would quit out of anger before this important work of economic stabilization is done. We must all move together if we are to curb inflation. There comes a time when the national interest is paramount. That time is now, and it is regrettable that any person or group would not be willing to put his own interests second to the interests of the entire country.

One of America's greatest strengths has always been its ability to compromise, its ability to bring together divergent points of view for the common good. On the other hand, some of our greatest problems have arisen when any one group has decided to throw in the towel on established ways of doing things, has decided that their one group could best decide things for all the people, adopting a sort of "my way or I will not play" attitude.

Steps have been taken in the last 8 months or so to bring galloping inflation under control. Statistics indicate that these steps are working. But these steps were always based on one important assumption: That substantially all the people would be willing to cooperate, would be willing to put the national interest above all else. It is my hope that those members who resigned from the Pay Board will reconsider and will return to make a contribution to economic stabilization.

GRADE SCHOOL CHILDREN TO MARCH

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) over the utilization of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia to propagandize their parents.

I am particularly distressed by a flyer bearing a cartoon which personally attacks the President of the United States. I think it is in grossly poor taste. I also deplore the fact that officials of the District of Columbia school system are exploiting children for propaganda purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this shocking cartoon because it attacks Mr. Nixon as an individual. I deplore it because it at-

tacks him as the President of the United States who, regardless of political affiliation or position on a particular issue is entitled to respect. I deplore it because innocent children are being manipulated for political purposes.

A SUCCESSFUL FEED GRAIN SIGNUP

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the final feed grain signup figures announced by Secretary Butz in Kansas City yesterday afternoon show a most gratifying participation by American farmers. The 37 million-plus crop-acres already enrolled more than double the 17-million-acre set-aside of last year. This should reduce corn production substantially and give our farmers a chance for more adequate prices in the marketplace next fall.

No doubt there will be some "gloom-sayers" who will continue to predict another huge corn crop and repeat their oft-repeated opinion that the 1970 Agriculture Act cannot possibly succeed. But by this heavy signup the feed grain producers of American have demonstrated their confidence in and strong support of the present program. The Secretary has for his part certainly used the flexible features of the program to good advantage, adding new options when the original provisions did not appear to be attracting sufficient participation.

I am, of course, happy to note that my own State of Iowa exceeded its USDA assigned goal of 3.8 million acres by almost 300,000 acres. Iowa has once again enrolled the most acres, followed by Texas, Nebraska, and Illinois, in that order.

I want to commend all ASCS personnel at the Federal, State, and local level for outstanding performance of duty in conducting this signup. The extra options added in the revisions made their task of explaining the program to producers unusually difficult this year. And this burden came hard on the heels of extremely heavy loan activity arising from the large corn carryover, with a combination of loan processing and signups requiring much extra time and effort from ASCS staffers. But the wide spread participation announced yesterday shows they certainly rose to the occasion. It is not inconsiderable achievement to have more than doubled the acres set aside from 1 year to the next.

I congratulate the Department of Agriculture and the Nation's farmers on getting the 1972 feed grain program off to such a good start. They have improved prospects for a successful program and an improvement in feed grain income this year.

CHILDREN'S MARCH

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentle-

man from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) have indicated, of all the demonstrations that have taken place in the Nation's Capital in recent years, the so-called Children's March for Survival scheduled for this Saturday is by far the most cynical and ill conceived.

The National Welfare Rights Organization and other groups sponsoring this demonstration are using the lure of puppet shows, theater, and games, free kites and balloons to politicize little children for their own purposes.

In so doing, they have been guilty of a vicious and slanderous attack on our Nation's President by distributing in the public schools of this city a pamphlet containing a cartoon of the President with the caption, "Nixon doesn't care" about hungry children.

Such tactics can only rebound to the detriment of their expressed cause, the sidetracking of the President's welfare reform proposal and a workable program of day care for the children of working mothers, reducing Federal aid to the District, and delaying home rule.

I urge the sponsors of this demonstration to reconsider the folly and the waste and the dangers of perverting little children's minds in this political fashion. The reaction of the Congress and the public will be the reverse of that for which they hope.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BRIEFING ON THE REPORTING ASPECTS OF THE NEW CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE LAW

(Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to make the announcement that on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, of next week in the hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means, there will be a briefing, morning and afternoon, on the reporting aspects of the new campaign expenditure law. That briefing will be carried out by a variety of people, but it will include the Clerk of the House and the Comptroller General of the United States. The morning briefing will be at 9:30 or 10 a.m.; the afternoon briefing will be at another time to be established. But each Member will receive written notice to this effect.

I am further informed that on Wednesday afternoon the new provisions of law dealing with tax deductibility, and so on, will be a special subject for that briefing.

CHILDREN'S MARCH

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, lobbying is a valid and traditional part of the legislative process. Public meetings and marches are often perfectly proper. But I am shocked at reports that schoolchildren in the District of

Columbia, who cannot possibly know what they are being asked to do, are being talked and hoodwinked into participating, directly or indirectly, in a lobbying march this Saturday that is completely out of line.

The reported attacks on President Nixon are unfounded, unfair, inaccurate, and slanderous.

For public tax dollars to be used for such purposes as those here involved, is counterproductive and will make much more difficult the task of those of us in this body who are genuinely interested in advancing the causes of the District and its people.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13955) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), and one-half to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13955, with Mr. ANNUNZIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the usual annual appropriation bill for the legislative branch of the Government for the next fiscal year. Included in the bill are funds for the operation of the House of Representatives, the various joint activities of the House and Senate, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress—including the Congressional Research Service—the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Cost-Accounting Standards Board.

Conforming to long practice, funds exclusively for operations and activities of the Senate—including two items jurisdictionally under the Architect of the Capitol—are left for decision and insertion by that body.

The various items in the bill are spelled

out in the committee report. Many more details are carried in the printed hearings. I will give a few highlights of the bill at this time.

This is the first year that I have had the privilege to serve as chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and it was with a heavy heart that I accepted this chairmanship. As you all know, the vacancy occurred due to the untimely death of our dear friend, the late George W. Andrews. Appropriately, the usual gratuity payable to the heirs of a deceased Member is included in this bill for his widow. It is a difficult assignment to follow in his footsteps.

The weight of my task has been lifted through the help and cooperation of the chairman of our full committee, Mr. MAHON of Texas, and all of the members of the subcommittee—Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HATHAWAY of Maine, Mr. ROUSH of Indiana, Mr. BEVILL of Alabama who was appointed to fill the vacancy on the subcommittee, Mr. CEDERBERG of Michigan, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, and Mr. WYATT of Oregon. I purposely omitted mentioning Mr. Bow of Ohio, the ranking minority member of both the full committee and of the subcommittee as this will be the last year he will be helping to present this bill to the House. We regret he is not going to be with us after the close of this Congress, but we wish him well in his forthcoming retirement from active congressional service.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill contains recommendations totaling \$427,604,764, which is \$47,030,661 below appropriations enacted to date for fiscal year 1972 and \$6,022,240 less than was requested in the budget for fiscal year 1973. Appropriations for 1972 enacted to date total \$474,635,425. The budget estimates for 1973 considered by the committee total \$433,627,004.

In considering the comparison with 1972, it should be noted that appropriations have not yet been made to cover the half-year cost of the 5.5-percent pay increase which went into effect on January 1, 1972, as well as certain wage board salary increases. Appropriations to cover these 1972 pay costs will be included in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1972, which is scheduled to be reported next month. A total of \$17,251,700 is included in the bill we are considering today to cover the cost of the pay raises in fiscal year 1973.

The fact that total recommendations are \$47,030,661 less than 1972 appropriations is due to two nonrecurring items in 1972. The 1972 appropriations included \$32,994,000 for the cost of reimbursing the U.S. Postal Service for official mail costs of the Congress for 2 years—1971 and 1972. The amount for 1972 was made for advance payments on a quarterly basis to conform with practice in effect throughout the rest of the Federal Government. Appropriations for 1972 also included \$71,090,000 for construction of the new Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

As I noted earlier, the recommendations for 1973 are \$6,022,240 less than requested. This reduction is primarily in three areas: first, funds requested for

reimbursing the U.S. Postal Service for the costs of handling congressional mail; second, additional staff requested for the Congressional Research Service, and third, additional staff requested for the General Accounting Office.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The sum of \$141,601,770 is recommended for the operation of the House of Representatives during the coming year. This is \$9,009,200 more than has been appropriated to date for the current year and over \$6,000,000 is for pay increases and related costs. The remainder is primarily within the categories of workload and increased costs. The House has authorized additional allowances for itself, there is an increasing utilization of clerk-hire by the Members, and full year funding has been provided for the 214 new police positions on the House side authorized last year. Taking into account the pending pay supplemental for 1972, the increase is \$6,093,600. The allowance is \$359,500 less than requested.

I want to call special attention to the language in the report regarding the House Library-Documents Room. This activity, which by law is under the Office of the Clerk of the House, is a duplication of service and materials both with the Library of Congress and the Documents Room operated by the Doorkeeper of the House. In the opinion of the Committee, as stated in our report, this activity should be phased out by the end of fiscal year 1973. However, it is not the intention of the Committee that the library facility located at the back of this chamber, to my right, be closed. This small library facility is serving the immediate needs of the Members on a day-to-day basis when the House is in session and arrangements should be made to continue this service.

No funds are included in the bill for the installation of a closed circuit television system and other security apparatus in the various buildings on Capitol Hill under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 550 which was adopted by the House a week ago, on March 16. Inasmuch as this resolution requires action by the other body and there are some questions as to how the cost of such a system should be funded, no action has been taken at this time. Possibly consideration can be given to a supplemental appropriation later on.

The Clerk of the House requested \$327,000 for furnishing offices contemplated to be located in the Congressional Hotel. The request was denied as no definite plans have been made as to what activities might be housed in that building.

The committee has inserted \$5,000 for the procurement of a portrait of Speaker ALBERT. This is the longstanding practice.

JOINT ITEMS

A total of \$26,095,144 has been approved for the various joint activities of the House and Senate. This recommendation is \$11,624,011 below 1972 appropriations enacted to date and \$3,245,490 below the total amount requested for 1973. The entire reduction is in the reimbursement to the U.S. Postal Service

for official mail costs of the Congress, which I mentioned earlier. Appropriations for this purpose are now made in advance in accordance with forecasts of the Postal Service as to volume and cost. Payments are made on a quarterly basis and adjustments to actual costs will be made at the end of the year. The appropriation, as recommended, will become available immediately upon enactment of the bill into law and will be available for such adjustments as may be necessary for 1972. Adjustments necessary at the end of fiscal year 1973 can be considered at that time.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The bill includes recommended appropriations totaling \$19,764,900 for 1973 for those items of a joint nature or relating solely to the House. The recommendation is \$570,000 above the amount requested due to the inclusion of several reappropriations of unobligated balances required for the continuation of a number of construction and renovation projects into the next fiscal year.

There are no major projects funded in the 1973 budget. Most of the increases allowed are to meet pay costs and the increased costs of supplies and materials. The sum of \$50,000 has been provided for the continuing program of improvement and modernization of electrical wiring in the Capitol. Provision has been made for the alteration and modernization of three elevators on the House side of the Capitol. The Committee approved the installation of railings on sections of the central portico on the East Front of the Capitol, as well as modifications to the first floor corridor adjacent to the House restaurant and Sergeant at Arms bank. This work will be done in conjunction with the mural decoration project instigated by the Capitol Historical Society.

The bill also includes funds for the replacement of equipment and other improvements to the House restaurant facilities in both the Capitol and House office buildings. The Committee has approved \$98,300 to improve the two corridors in the Capitol leading to the Attending Physician's office and the Minority Leader's office. These corridors are currently most unattractive with a combination of white bathroom-type tile and windows reminiscent of tenement house back porches. The design proposed by the Architect is in keeping with the crypt and rotunda areas which are immediately adjacent to these corridors. Funds are also included for a security system for the steam and chilled water tunnels connecting the Capitol Power Plant and the various buildings on Capitol Hill served by that facility.

WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL

There are no funds in the bill for the West Front project. The Members of the House are aware of the action of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol on March 8, 1972, in directing the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front.

In reviewing the history preceding this action, I would refer back to Public Law 91-145, approved December 12, 1969.

This law, the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970, appropriated \$2,275,000 for the extension of the Capitol including \$250,000 for the employment of independent nongovernmental engineering and other services on the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front. The law provided, and I quote:

Provided further, That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lump sum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: Provided further, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol.

On July 1, 1970, Speaker McCormack, Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, announced the employment of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Engineers-Architects of New York, to make a study of the feasibility of restoring the west central front of the United States Capitol. The consulting firm submitted its report on December 30, 1970. The Commission met on March 8 and I quote from a portion of the resolution adopted unanimously by its members:

Whereas, the restoration feasibility and cost study and report of the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Consulting Engineers-Architects, made pursuant to Public Law 91-145, was considered by the Commission at its meeting of March 8, 1972, in Room EF-100 of the Capitol; and

Whereas, the Commission established to its satisfaction that all five of the conditions specified in Public Law 91-145, relating to restoration, cannot be met; Now, therefore, be it resolved.

That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby directed to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front in accord with Plan 2 heretofore approved by the Commission.

No additional money is needed at this time. The money for the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front was appropriated in Public Law 91-145. There is no need for construction funds at this time. They could not be utilized.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

An amount totaling \$78,161,450 is recommended for the operating expenses

of the Library in the coming fiscal year. The major increases for fiscal year 1973 relate to the Congressional Research Service. A request was made for 120 new positions. The committee has recommended 86, which will provide a total staff of 524.

Construction of the new James Madison Memorial Library Building is currently underway and occupancy is scheduled for February 1975. The bill provides \$4,000,000 for the initial outfitting of the building. Most of the money is for compact shelving. The committee was advised that approximately 20 months leadtime is required for the fabrication and installation of these shelving units.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The bill provides \$63,739,900 for the Government Printing Office which includes \$46,500,000 for congressional printing and binding. The remainder, \$17,239,900, is for the activities of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, which are primarily of a revenue producing nature.

The volume and cost of congressional printing and binding continues to increase. The allowance is an increase of \$8,500,000 over 1972 appropriations and includes \$7 million to reimburse a deficiency in the 1972 appropriation for charges incurred for fiscal year 1971 work which were paid out of the 1972 appropriation. There is no effective way to determine in advance the volume of congressional printing which the Government Printing Office is called upon to produce.

Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1973 work total \$39,500,000, an increase of \$5,500,000 over the \$34 million estimated for 1972. Three major areas of increase are the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; bills, resolutions, and amendments, and hearings. The cost per page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD continues to increase—from an estimated \$140 per page in 1972 to an estimated \$170 per page in 1973.

RESTRICTION ON PRINTING FUTURE EDITIONS OF UNITED STATES AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODES

The committee has included language in the bill, on page 26, which will restrict distribution of future new editions of the United States and District of Columbia Codes to each Member of the House and Senate to not more than two sets. Under the terms of the 1947 law (1 U.S.C. 211) each Member of the House and Senate is entitled to 10 sets, although the committee understands that the current practice is to limit distribution to five sets for House Members and seven sets for Senate Members. In an effort to avoid what looks like a nonessential expenditure, the committee has proposed this restriction. Over 2,900 sets of the 1970 edition of the United States Code have been delivered to the folding rooms of the two Houses for distribution to the Members and officers of the two bodies. The cost of printing the 1970 edition, which was done by the Government Printing Office, exceeds \$1 million and does not count the cost of printing supplements during the 6-year interim before a new edition is put out.

The restriction will go to only new

editions and will not affect supplements to the 1970 edition as they are published. It will not affect distribution to committees, including the Committees on the Judiciary. It will not affect the copies distributed to depository libraries, or to the Superintendent of Documents for sale. The restriction does not affect the availability of a set of the U.S. Code Annotated or the Federal Code Annotated under the authority of House Resolution 506 of the 90th Congress.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The bill provides \$95,820,000 for the operation of the General Accounting Office during the next fiscal year, and includes \$1,600,000 for the Office of Federal Elections. This office has been set up to carry out the activities assigned to the General Accounting Office by the Federal Election Campaign Act and the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act.

The Committee has allowed 120 of the 238 new positions requested which will provide a total of 4,889 man-years of employment in the regular staff and 35 man-years in the Office of Federal Elections.

CONCLUSION

I have outlined the highlights of the bill. The various items are explained in more detail in the report as well as the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I notice with interest that the new Postal Service Corporation attempted to charge the House on the basis of the first-class rate for all mail, letters or packages, sent out by Members and, of course, by the House committees. Apparently the Postal Service also ought to make this retroactive. Is it not correct, that they tried to charge the top rate for all mail, bulk as well as first-class mail?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is correct. The Post Office Department has been put on a business basis and the Postal Service officials are trying to get all the revenue they can. The gentleman is quite correct—they are going to try to bill us first-class rates for everything we send out.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that they are on the right track in trying to make the Postal Service pay its way to the fullest extent but they do not charge anyone else first-class rates for bulk mail, and I am pleased the committee denied the appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. We are going to see that we are not treated any differently from anyone else.

Mr. GROSS. That is precisely the point. As to the question of the budget for cars, I assume that the leadership is being well taken care of in the matter of Cadillacs these days?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman, you will find this bill provides for three automobiles and chauffeurs only.

Mr. GROSS. Only three?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. That represents a reduction?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Yes; I think it may over the years. This was not done this year, but possibly it has been done down through the years. We have only three—for the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and the minority leader. They are the only ones who have chauffeurs on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. I am getting more favorable reports than ever before with respect to this legislative housekeeping bill.

Now, with regard to special window glass for the Library of Congress—what occasions that?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. We did not allow the special windows for the Library of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. But they were asked for?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. They asked for them, but those windows would have cost about \$200 apiece. They would have cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$40,000 and it was just for the first floor. The committee wondered, if they were concerned about safety, why was the request just for the first floor. If somebody is going to throw a rock at them, they could throw it up to the second floor.

We did not think there should be any more concern for that particular facility than any other facility on the Hill or other Federal buildings in the city.

Mr. GROSS. Have they had window breakage at the Library of Congress?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. There has been no particular destruction at the Library of Congress and that was one of the reasons we thought we should deny this request. They based their request on anticipated trouble—there was fear on their part.

Mr. GROSS. The committee is allowing the General Accounting Office \$1,600,000 for this new Federal Elections Office.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. What provision is being made for the Clerk of the House, whose office, I assume will do most of the work for the House of Representatives?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. The Clerk has been authorized a number of new positions by the Committee on House Administration. He told us this is a new operation and he might be coming back with a request for additional funds. But as of right now he has what we think he should have in order to carry out the duties placed upon him.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman briefly state what the function of the General Accounting Office will be in this matter?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. The General Accounting Office will gather information on the presidential race. It includes primary expenditures and what-have-you. They will receive and retain that information on expenditures for public view and reporting as required by the act. They are supposed to make audits, as I understand, to see if there have been any violations.

Mr. GROSS. But the GAO will have no function with respect to the House or Senatorial elections?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. It is my opinion that they will not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his responses.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. I observe with great pleasure that there is restrictive language in the bill which will provide for the phasing out of the House library. Does the gentleman have any idea as to how much money this will save if this library is phased out?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. No; I really do not, though I think it would be a little less than \$100,000. I will say this: The gentleman from Indiana is one of those who raised this question, and I commend him for it. He has gone into other phases of activities funded in this bill. He probably knows the answers better than I do, since he has been so active in exploring some of these duplications of services that we should be dispensing with.

Mr. ROUSH. It is true, is it not—and I do not know the exact amount—but it is true that there are nine employees involved in the operation of that library?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is true, but I do not think you can say that we are going to phase out all of them, because we want to retain the library at the back of the Chamber.

Mr. ROUSH. Would not the gentleman agree that that library just off the House floor could be operated by the Library of Congress, just as they operate their annexes over in the Rayburn Building, perhaps even with greater efficiency in that during the time we are discussing a bill which has reference to a particular subject, they could supply experts to be on hand during that period of time?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I will not go that far, but I would agree with the gentleman until we have an opportunity to dig into the question a little more. I will say that we have started the task. I am with you in phasing out the duplication of services that are unnecessary.

By the same token, I do not want to see the membership denied services they have been getting and need. There seems to be satisfaction with the service rendered by this small floor facility. I do not want to get someone who is not responsible to the House running such a facility.

Mr. ROUSH. I would certainly agree with the gentleman in that regard. I would advise the gentleman and also the other Members of the House that I have now legislation in hand, which will be introduced next Wednesday, which will do away with this House Library, which is, according to the officials of the Congressional Library, entirely duplicatory of the work they are doing and work which is being done elsewhere, as far as the document room is concerned, this could be easily absorbed by the document room, which is presently run by the Doorkeeper.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Again I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana on his very active participation in the hearings and also for his diligence in trying to help us save money. I think you are doing it in a proper manner, that

is, submitting a measure for full hearing and investigation.

Mr. ROUSH. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to refer to the printing of the United States Code. As the gentleman knows, I advocated that we do away with the furnishing to Members of the United States Code, period. I did this because of the provision in the law which permits a Member to receive a copy of the United States Code Annotated. There may be some wisdom in the action that the committee has taken here, and I am certainly not at this time going to object to it. However, I would also like to advise the House in this connection that it is my intention to seek an amendment to the law which provides for the providing of a Member with the United States Code Annotated, which will place that set of books in the Member's possession, just as we place a typewriter in a Member's possession. It belongs to the office and not the Member.

The law also provides that a Member who leaves the Congress, as I did, and comes back can get another set of the United States Code Annotated. I think that again is ridiculous. I was offended when a book salesman came to me with a twinkle in his eye and suggested I had available to me a second set of this very, very expensive legal set of books.

I want to compliment my chairman for the diligence he has given to these matters. I believe there is much to be done, and I appreciate the chairman's indication that he is going to look into many of these matters in the future when we have the time and opportunity to do so. I think the gentleman has done a remarkable job in these very few weeks he has had the chairmanship of the committee.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I sincerely thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to congratulate the chairman on the work of the subcommittee. I note with pleasure an entry which indicates a considerable sum for the revision of Cannon's Procedure and Hinds' Precedents of the House. Can the gentleman give us any indication as to when the new edition of the Precedents can be made available to the Members?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I cannot tell the gentleman when it will be made available. There has been some delay in finding the caliber of people needed to do the work.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can provide an authoritative answer, except I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentarian. As I recall, he advised me it would be probably 2 or 3 years before they would be available.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think I would like to direct a question to the gentleman in connection with the Congressional Research Service. It was my understanding that the Director of the Congressional Research Service had sought, as I recall, 120 new positions. I believe—is it not correct, Mr. Chairman—that 86 of those positions have been allowed in this bill?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. That is correct. There have been 120 requested, and we are recommending 86, which will increase the staff to 524. They were given 75 new positions last year.

The gentleman knows we are anxious to see that the Members of this House get all the service they need, and that was the purpose of creating and expanding the Congressional Research Service. By the same token, it is difficult to find some of the people qualified in the areas required.

Certainly we want them to build up as rapidly as possible, but we do not want to overdo it to the extent that unqualified people are hired. We have confidence in them, but we are concerned over how rapidly they are growing—and frankly, also, we have to find proper space for them to operate in this year.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield further, let me commend my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. I know of his interest in this matter. I appreciate it very much. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and I have had an opportunity to testify before the gentleman's committee to indicate our interest, and I am in no sense criticizing the action of the committee, but I am only trying to take care of many of us who are very much concerned about seeing that the Congressional Research Service is built up as rapidly as possible to meet the needs of Members and the needs that were in the minds of the Congress at the time of the Reorganization Act.

I want to commend the gentleman for his making at least a substantial improvement over what was in the bill last year.

I well recognize, and I want to agree with the gentleman that these are specialists and very highly qualified people if we are going to get the kind of people who will do the job. They are not easy to come by.

As I say, I am not here in any way criticizing, but I would like to set the record straight. I understand there was some statement made that I might offer an amendment in connection with this matter. I am not going to offer such an amendment, but I want to join with the chairman and other members of the committee in urging that the committee continue to watch this matter, and to the extent we can that we make of the Congressional Research Service as quickly as possible a true source of expertise and help and assistance for the committees of Congress, in the House and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in yielding and his

courtesy to myself and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), for their desire to see that the intent of the reorganization act which the gentleman handled and sponsored, of upgrading service to the Members of the House, is carried out. I assure the gentleman if we find we have made a mistake we will come back here and give assistance.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, has given us the details of this appropriation bill, and certainly there is not any reason to go over that ground. Therefore, I will take but a very few minutes.

I should like to say that the subcommittee has restrictions as to how far it can go in cutting this kind of a bill, or any kind of a bill, because of the legislation which makes these appropriations in order.

I would also say, when we refer to actions taken in the legislative area by other committees, that places more burdens mostly on the General Accounting Office. Almost all the legislation we pass these days gives them new responsibility. This naturally requires that we give them new personnel and funds to finance them.

There has been discussion as to the congressional reorganization, called congressional reform. This has caused increases in personnel and increases in cost.

Then there is the election reform bill, which is placing an unusual burden on the General Accounting Office. No one really knows what burden is going to be placed on the Clerk of the House or the Clerk of the Senate, so we will have to feel our way along on that type of legislation.

I believe it is fair to say, on congressional reform, until we get the regulations we as Members of the House do not know where we stand. So it is going to be some time before we really know what the increased costs are going to be as to implementing much of this legislation.

We have done our best under the able guidance of the chairman of the subcommittee to provide what we think is necessary to carry on the activities covered in this bill.

We have not given any of the agencies everything it wanted. We cut the personnel request of the General Accounting Office and of the Congressional Research Service, and I believe we cut some for the Clerk of the House, who, I can see, is on the floor today carefully watching us as we pass out the appropriation over which he will have a great deal of jurisdiction.

I can only say I believe we in the subcommittee have diligently tried to do what is necessary to provide services for the legislative branch. I believe the legislative branch and the areas under our jurisdiction deserve the same kind of consideration, no better but no worse

than the treatment of other agencies either in the judiciary or the administrative branch of the Government. This is what we have tried to do, and I believe we have done it.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time today because I would like to be able to offer an amendment to this particular legislation, dealing, of course, as Members are well aware, I believe, with a subject which has concerned me for a number of years since I first came here, the west front of the Capitol.

I would like to offer that amendment today, but unfortunately the only meaningful kind of amendment to meet my purpose would represent legislation on an appropriation bill and would therefore be out of order; so I am not able to offer it.

There is nothing in this particular bill on the west front, but the legislative appropriation bill has traditionally been the vehicle by which we in the House have had the opportunity, and the only opportunity, and a somewhat limited opportunity, it was, to address ourselves to this question of whether the west front should or should not be extended.

So I think it is appropriate that as we discuss this bill for fiscal year 1973 we should at least bring ourselves up to date on this particular issue of the west front, even though we are estopped at the moment from doing anything about it. Members who have been here for a couple of terms will recall the last time we had any discussion on this subject was in December 1969 on the 1970 legislative appropriation bill. That was a very detailed discussion and a rather bitter one. We had a record vote and we took a number of other actions in this House to deal with the subject of the west front and to try to resolve some of the controversies that occurred at that time in that particular bill.

In fact the very thing I object to most here today is that there is nothing in this bill today that would give us any opportunity to deal with this subject in the light of what has happened since 1969. The details of the study we ordered in 1969 have now been made public, and yet the House itself is denied an opportunity to vote one way or the other on this controversy in the light of this study. Unfortunately a preliminary decision on that has already been made in secret, behind closed doors, with no record, and without even the courtesy of a discussion of the facts that were made available to Congress in a study authorized back in 1969.

Those who were here in 1969 will recall the big argument given at that time for extending the west front of the Capitol—and the gentleman from Illinois (SEN. YATES) was down here with charts and drawings and practically terrorizing every Member of the House into believing that we stood in imminent danger of destruction—was that George Stewart had told us that the whole front was going to fall down unless we approved the extension project.

So in order to find out whether that

charge was true and whether the only way to prevent the west front from falling down was to extend it, we appropriated \$200,000 for an independent, professional study by an expert firm of engineers. That study was made and was submitted to the Congress in January 1971.

In spite of all the heart-rending arguments we had heard on the floor, this report said conclusively and decisively not only that that claim was a lot baloney, and that the west front of the Capitol is not falling down, but that you do not have to extend it in order to fix it up. That repair job in fact, can done for \$13.7 million instead of the \$45 million or \$60 million or \$70 million that might be otherwise required for the extension so the Praeger report concluded.

Mr. JACOBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. Let me just complete my argument, if I may, and then I will be glad to discuss the matter with the gentleman.

Yet, in spite of the fact that that report had been made by a reputable firm—and we got all of the best people in the industry and in the engineering field to recommend who should do the study—there has never been one single word of comment by the so-called commission on the extension of the Capitol about the fact that the Praeger report had totally demolished the argument of George Stewart and Mr. Campioli and Sir Yates and everyone else who had been talking about the west front.

Instead, other day, on the 8th of March, 15 months after the Praeger report was made public, they met in some quiet little chamber in the capitol and said:

We are going to go ahead and extend the Capitol in spite of that report and in spite of the cost.

Now, how did they justify that action? Well, they hung their argument on two things. First, the 1969 legislation had said that five conditions had to be met to end the extension plan. One of them was that you had to be able to restore the Capitol for not more than \$15 million. Actually the Praeger report says you can do the restoration job for \$13.7 million. Yet this group of nonengineers, these nontechnicians said:

We are not sure; maybe restoration might cost more than \$15 million; so we are going to turn down the whole report and instead foist a \$60 million or \$70 million cost on the American taxpayers.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to present my argument first, because it is somewhat complicated, and then I will be delighted to discuss the issue with the gentleman.

So what other reason did they give for undertaking this great expense, now that we know for certain that the west front is not falling down? Well, they claim we need more office space in the Capitol. So, we are going to have to turn this Nation's number-one historic shrine into a grand Howard Johnson's, and provide 253 special, hideaway offices for senior Members who do not want to ride back to the Ray-

burn, Longworth or Cannon Buildings in between quorum calls or recorded teller votes. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, that we are told we will have to spend \$45 million or \$50 million more than we need to on the west front. Yes, we are going to destroy the Nation's number-one historic shrine, and we are going to cover up the last remnants of a historic building that even the British were not able to destroy in 1814.

That is the issue that is really facing us, even if we are not being allowed to vote on it.

Do you want to let them go ahead and make that decision? Or should not we, as Members of the Congress who authorized this study back in 1969, at least have the right to vote on what we best ought to do in the light of the conclusions of the Praeger report, for which we spent so much money.

And the thing that disturbs me most, Mr. Chairman, concerns the Architect of the Capitol. Those who were here during the 1969 controversy will recall that one of the biggest issues was that we had an Architect of the Capitol who was not really an architect. George Stewart never made any pretense to being an architect. He was a builder, and he wanted to build—and, by gosh, he certainly did build. And he did everything he could to push his building projects through. He even put those dramatic supports out there on the west front and led everybody to believe the building really was going to collapse, so he could build up more psychological momentum to construct a new west front, and so have another memorial building project to his credit. Well, George Stewart passed away and we got ourselves another architect, and we got what we had been trying to get—a real, professional architect. In fact he was a member of the prestigious American Institute of Architects, who had been one of those who had said very clearly, as an architect, that this historic Capitol building should not be tampered with.

Well, what happened? Once this new Architect, George White, went to work, he forgot all about being a professional architect. Instead he became an office boy. He let himself be pushed around by the establishment who told him: "We just have to have more of those hide-away office spaces." And so instead of giving the Congress the benefit of his professional ability as an architect Mr. White allowed himself to be pushed around. Well, Mr. Chairman, we already have enough people down in that office now, beginning with Mr. Campioli, who can easily be pushed around by the establishment.

What we needed was an architect with the courage of his convictions. But this fellow has not given his professional opinion to the Members of Congress. And I have said he ought to resign. I say it again: I feel sincerely he should resign. He is flying under false colors.

So this is where we stand today, Mr. Chairman. We have \$2 million appropriated back in the 1970 bill which is going to be used now for plans on a project that we have already had in the planning stage for 10 years. I just hope

that money will continue to be used, as it should be used for planning on paper, and will not be used for clandestine construction work, because at some time we are going to have to vote on this issue. I think that this House ought to be able to make that final decision, and I just hope the Architect doesn't try to be cute and use his \$2 million to try to present us with a fait accompli we would have trouble reversing.

If the future of the country lies in the hands of the collective wisdom of the House and Senate, then why is it that the future of the Capitol Building shall be so unique and all-important that decisions affecting it cannot be handled except by the top leadership?

That is the issue we ought to address ourselves to, and I am sorry it is not here for us to act on. But I have introduced appropriate legislation. I had a special order on this on the 16th of March, and I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to every Member of Congress on the 20th of March. I know we are all fed up with "Dear Colleague" letters; but if you are interested in this important issue of the west front it is only one page long. All the relevant arguments are there. I hope that you will read it and I welcome the support of Members in this fight—which is only now beginning, I might add.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no one here who may seriously question my interest in and my concern for the preservation of the Capitol. Few, I believe, and I confess humbly, surpass my interest in the history and the heritage of this great monument, our Capitol.

I will begin by suggesting to you and telling you, as many of you already know, that originally as a historian, I was opposed to both the east front and the west front extensions. But because of my growing interest, I researched this question and I have studied it in depth. The original plans were considered. The needs were noted. I have changed my mind. I was wrong and I have said so at different times on the floor of the House.

One of our troubles around here is that an institution for publicity in this area insists on only publishing one side of the story. On March 8 and 9, I took the floor and discussed this matter and commented on the decision of the Commission. This organization for publicity was made known of this, but not one line was in the paper. But, the opposition was there.

So I invite now, Mr. Chairman, the publicity facilities here, and one in particular, to pay attention to another side and to note what other people have said who are competent and who are interested and who are just as dedicated and concerned about this.

Now having commented on that, let me talk about change. My colleagues, there have been many changes in this Capitol Building. It is not a status quo-

building just as this Nation is not a status quo institution.

We had the original design—and the first dome was a low dome. Then wisely and because the Congress needed more space, in 1850 a move was made to expand the Capitol and the result is this room—with one comparable to it on the Senate side.

Then it was noted that there was something wrong with that low dome and that it was out of proportion. So it was recommended that we put a dome on like you see on the Capitol.

Then there was the question of need for balance on the west front and the terrace idea was conceived and an extension was conceived at that time.

In 1904 this Congress, looking forward to that extension part of the project to develop some bronze doors and there are three magnificent bronze doors on the east front now and they tell a magnificent story of our early history.

There is another set of doors which will be on display soon that will be designed for the west front, but because something happened we never could get on with this business. Every time it was up, there was somebody on the House floor opposing it. Even when we changed from gas light to electric light, some of the wise men in the Congress on the House and Senate side both commend: Well, what is the matter with the gas light? This electric business is just a fad and it is dangerous and we should not do it.

There was debate about the dome. So change has been a tradition and the status quo has not been the tradition.

Now as to the hideways—I have been, I think, and every man can if he wants to, get into every room in this building. Some are not convenient to get into—you have to go through a manhole to explore the area where they dug there one time.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to see the gentleman get into the room where this committee met, the Appropriations Committee. I understand that no Members of Congress except members of the committee were admitted while the hearings were going on.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I knew about those hearings. But I happen to trust those people very much. They are our representatives.

While we are commenting on that, I will say I have been able to find it and I have gone there and no discourtesy was shown. I found out what took place there. There was an honest evaluation of the facts and they were acting in accordance with the wishes of the Congress.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Does the gentleman take the position that hearings on the expenditure of public money should be closed, that that is perfectly all right, and that we should just trust the members of the committee?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not endorse that, of course, but that is not the question.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. The committee was glad to receive all Members who expressed an interest in coming to the committee, and all such Members did come and were heard.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. That is not an answer to my question. The question is whether Members can attend, not as witnesses, but to observe other witnesses. I would like the committee to state whether that would be permitted.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Under the provisions of Congress, as the act was passed originally, the amendment called for a study and report, that the Commission would make the judgments, they did so, and they reported. When this happened, I went down here to see what happened. As far as I was concerned, they were very courteous.

I know what has taken place. I have every confidence in the judgment of these people, and I have confidence, I will say, in the new Architect. He is a qualified architect, and to question his integrity when he comes here is just not fair. I do not believe these kinds of people are affected by politics and political pressures. He could make a lot more money than he is getting, I believe, in private practice. So why should he worry about a job? Why should he not represent the best interests of the people?

Someone mentioned Campioli. He was one of the great architects of all time. He was hired by the Rockefeller Foundation and developed the Williamsburg layout there. This man is a traditionalist. Originally, like myself, he was opposed to both the east front and the west front extensions. But he was wise enough to recognize the facts and he changed his mind.

Now, I am not worried about hideaways. Any Member of the Congress can get into any room in the Capitol he wants to get into, and that includes those rooms that are used by Members on the other side. Of course, there are not nearly so many over here. Percentagewise, more of the Members on the other side can be taken care of.

Let me tell you about a great need here, my friends. The dome section of the Capitol, to me, is holy ground. That is the center of this building. That is where a lot of important events have taken place. That is where our great statesmen have lain in state. That is the reception center. I am ashamed of it.

I do not like something else. When a carload of people come here from Iowa, Texas, Indiana, New York, or elsewhere, some of whom are 65 years of age and older, they have to park a block and a half away, walk, climb 47 steps, and there is not even a restroom anywhere in the area. There is no place to sit down and relax. But there will be if we have an extension. We will have a nice drive-

way up the west front. They can walk 14 steps, get on a moving platform, and move into the reception center and begin their tour at that point. What is wrong with that? Nothing, of course.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I want to commend the gentleman for his activities in seeing that the Capitol becomes what it should be, a thing of beauty. If Members will look around, they will see that little by little we are accomplishing some of the things that need to be done. They will notice that our old Chambers are starting to get a little cleaning. Our committee has helped in getting junk off the balcony. I think by the time the centennial arrives and we have our celebration, we will have more pride in this building.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I now want to comment for the RECORD on the following questions:

First. Statements relating to Congressman STRATTON's remarks on the floor March 16, 1972; the action of the Commission March 8, 1972; and the restoration and other reports.

Second. Resolution of the Commission March 8, 1972, containing the Commission's decision and the law relating to the restoration study and the extension of the Capitol.

Third. Law authorizing the extension of the central portion of the Capitol—east and west fronts—under direction of the Commission created therein.

Fourth. Editorial from the Evening Star, March 10, 1972.

Fifth. Memorandum from the Architect to the Commission, March 6, 1972.

Sixth. Background of George M. White, Architect of the Capitol.

The material referred to follows:

NOTES ON WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

(If Congressman Stratton tries to stop planning through amendment or other device on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1973)

1. Stratton stated in his speech on the floor of the House, March 1972, that he had introduced three separate bills to accomplish his objectives. These bills were referred to the Committee on Public Works. Why is he now attempting to circumvent the regular legislative processes through an appropriation bill?

2. The House debated the West Front problem fully on September 19, 1969, and agreed to appropriate \$2,000,000 for the final planning of the extension. Mr. Stratton's amendment to stop this was defeated by the House, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 19, page 26389.

As far as the House was concerned, we could have proceeded then, more than 2 years ago, with the extension, which would have saved the escalation that has resulted in the meantime—some \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

It was only after the insistence of some members of the other body that the provision for a so-called restoration study was agreed to in conference and the extension was postponed until the restoration study could be received and studied.

Any escalation of the cost of the extension, therefore, can be laid at the doorstep of the restorationist. It is not the fault of

the Commission or the Architect of the Capitol.

3. The Commission composed of the Speaker, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader on this side; the President of the Senate, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader on the Senate side; and the Architect of the Capitol, is about as representative of the Membership of the Congress as anyone could hope for. Yet, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton) would characterize the Commission as some kind of a monster who goes about making arbitrary decisions. He even wants the Commission abolished. Well, I think we can all draw our own conclusions from such explosive oratory. If he can't have his way, then all is wrong.

4. The Commission has done precisely what the Congress mandated in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1970. The charge that we have done otherwise is absolute nonsense.

Five conditions were spelled out in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970, which restoration must meet in order to be considered by the Commission. If all those considered were not met to the satisfaction of the Commission, then the law said the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for the extension as already approved by the Commission. This is exactly what the Commission has done.

5. Before our meeting of March 8, 1972, the Commission had received from the Architect of the Capitol the restoration report, the Architect's comments on the report and on his effort going back over a period of more than a year, and his professional judgments relating to the west front problem. At the meeting, we had available the Preliminary Plans and estimates of cost for the extension, and all the background information, including hearings, debate on the floor, committee reports, etc., during the last several years on this question.

Near the close of the Commission's discussion, Congressman Ford, read aloud each of the 5 conditions specified by the law and asked Architect White to comment on each one. The following resulted:

"(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future."

Mr. White stated that the wall can be made relatively safe and sound. However, he said, there is grave doubt that it can be made durable and beautiful except with continued and substantial maintenance.

Representative Ford then read the next condition:

"(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2."

Mr. White said that this was a true statement.

Representative Ford then read the following conditions:

"(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

"(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000;"

Mr. White stated that conditions 3 and 4, taken together, cannot, in his opinion, be said to be capable of attainment.

Representative Ford then read condition (5):

"That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: Provided further, That after consideration of the restoration report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified

are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol."

Mr. White stated that condition (5) can be met.

Mr. White said that after a great deal of study and soul-searching, he concluded that he should not think in terms of "preservation" or "extension", but he should think in terms of what would best serve the people of the Nation. The building has a tremendous meaning for the people because it is to them a symbol of democracy and a Temple of Liberty. He said that the great mass of the people who view the Capitol see it as a beautiful scene and are unconcerned with the theoretical priorities of importance of various exterior features. Their money, he concluded, would be best spent by proceeding with the extension rather than trying to save the one remaining old wall.

Mr. White was asked if he had complete jurisdiction of the building and full responsibility for it, would he restore it or extend? He said without hesitation that he would extend the old west central front.

6. George M. White, Architect of the Capitol: Mr. White was highly recommended to the President for appointment in his present position by the American Institute of Architects. He is a professional engineer, a professional architect, as well as a member of the bar. When he was appointed as Architect of the Capitol, he was an officer of the AIA. His leanings were toward restoration as a result of his association with the AIA. After studying the west front problem for more than a year and after his experience as Architect of the Capitol, he felt compelled in the interest of sound judgment and good planning to recommend the extension, rather than the so-called restoration.

7. Mr. Stratton mentions the cost of the restoration study, of approximately \$245,000. It should be remembered that the Congress also spent some \$266,000 for the extension study, preliminary plans and estimates of cost, which were also before the Commission when its decision was made and which have been before the Congress since 1967. Every Member of the Congress was sent a copy by former Speaker McCormack.

8. Mr. Stratton says the Commission's action was wrong "no matter what the 1970 appropriation bill may say." The gentleman is well known as a "law and order" man. Why then would he expect the Commission to ignore the very precise provisions of the law?

9. Mr. Stratton says the restoration report "totally demolished all the contentions that had underlain the long pressure for the West Front extension."

Mr. White, a professional architect and engineer, says that is not true. He says "The structural adequacy of the west wall is, in fact, indeterminate. As many experts will declare that it is stable as will say that it is unstable. But even those who support the position of stability admit to the indeterminacy of the loading computations and, therefore, say that the wall should be strengthened as an insurance against the probability of a possible failure." Even the restoration report recommends structural restoration.

10. Mr. Stratton seeks to prove that all five conditions are met by the restoration study. Even those who prepared the restoration did not believe this was true. Example:

In the transmittal letter accompanying the restoration, it is stated:

"The restoration can be accomplished within the general guidelines set forth by Congress as a directive to the Commission for Extension of the Capitol."

Page IV of the report under "Findings" it is stated:

"Restoration methods can be specified to form a basis for performance of the work by competitive lump sum construction bids."

Page 15 of the report:

"A cost plus contract with an 'upset price' seems more realistic and could be obtained on a competitive basis."

Commenting on the first quotation: The Congress enacted five specifics—not general guidelines.

Commenting on the second quotation: No where in the report is there an explanation of how this can be accomplished. Just a bare statement.

Commenting on the third quotation: This is, in effect, an admission that those responsible for the restoration agree that a lump sum bid procedure cannot be utilized—they recommend a cost plus procedure for the restoration work.

11. Mr. Stratton admits that the cost of restoration could go over the \$15,000,000 limit established by the Congress, but he attributes this to escalation. The restoration report in explaining the cost estimates (page 15) says: "Unit costs include an escalation factor."

12. Mr. Stratton does not like what the Commission has done. Well, that is no surprise. And we respect his right to differ, but in so doing he should look at all the facts, and not just those that suit his purpose. The decision on the West Front was made and should have been made on the facts, the evidence, and sound judgment—not upon intemperance, wild and misleading statements such as we have read of late in the Congressional Record and in at least one local newspaper.

13. The decision of the Commission was a wise, thoughtful, and reasonable decision. It was made in an atmosphere of calm study and consideration, with each Member of the Commission taking part and expressing his views. Still, there was a unanimous vote in favor of going ahead with the extension.

14. Hideaways—Mr. Stratton says there is no reason to extend the building except to have "secret hideaways" in the Capitol. When the East Front was extended, the House portion was put to use for official business of the House—there are no hideaways in that extension. Why should he try to mislead the public and his colleagues into thinking the West Front extension would be given over for hideaways for House Members?

ADDITIONAL RESPONSES TO STRATTON'S REMARKS

1. Remarks have been made by Stratton concerning the proposed extension transforming the Capitol into a super Howard Johnson's, inferring that the appearance of the building would change and that the interior would provide services of that nature. Such demagoguery obscures the facts and speaks only to the emotions. A model of the extended building has been in Statuary Hall for several years. Can anyone see any Howard Johnson appearance in that design? The old plan to provide visitors' facilities in the Capitol has long since been abandoned in favor of the new Visitor Center in Union Station. The exterior of the extension will be a faithful continuation of the classical design of the Capitol with which everyone is familiar. The renderings of the Associate Architects' proposal are and have been available for everyone to see and clearly indicate the enhancement of the magnificent appearances of the building.

2. Remarks by Stratton and Randall regarding the Washington Post editorial state their agreement that the editorial was "well reasoned and reach valid conclusions." On the contrary, the editorial was intemperate, emotional, inflammatory and largely non-factual.

The editorial characterizes the Commission's unanimous decisions as "an arrogant maneuver of dubious legality." Even Mr. Stratton admits the legality of the decision when he says, "It is true that the provi-

sions of Public Law 91-145 do not require the Commission to justify their decision or to make any report to anybody."

The editorial criticizes the design itself, when even the American Institute of Architects in their testimony stated that the design was not in question. To the contrary, some of the most respected designers of classical architecture in the Nation have viewed the proposed design as an improvement to the West Central Front.

The editorial states that "William Thornton's softly elegant sandstone facade is the only visible link to the Capitol's beginnings." What sandstone? The original sandstone has been covered with layer upon layer of gray paint since 1819. Plate #1 in the Praeger report clearly shows the cracked, messy and miserable appearance of the so-called elegant stone once the paint is removed.

The editorial says that the Olmstead terraces will be ruined. Not so. In fact, changes to them will hardly be noticeable and, instead, they will become more beautiful and broader in vista than they are now. Even the American Society of Landscape Architects (and Olmstead was a Landscape Architect) reviewed the plan and had no objection to it. The perspective of the dome will be enhanced by the design strength of the new pediment that will be incorporated over the extended portico.

So, it is rather obvious that the last vestige of objectivity was wrung from the editorial policy of the Post in this instance.

3. Mr. Randall remarks that "As I recall, all the Architects of America were against this change and all the historians were against it." That is a blatant exaggeration to say the very least. A substantial number of highly respected and nationally prominent architects have testified and expressed themselves in favor of the extension. The official position of the American Institute of Architects is by no means representative of all of the architects in the Institute membership, and certainly doesn't represent even the majority opinion of all of the registered architects in America.

It is also interesting to note that the Architect of the Capitol was a Vice-President and Member of the Board of Directors of the American Institute of Architects and he also opposed the extension until he became aware of all of the facts involved, and he has now changed his position and supports extension.

4. Stratton remarks that the Praeger report confirms that the Capitol is not going to collapse. *Not true.* The Praeger report clearly says that in their opinion collapse is not imminent, but because of the indeterminacy of the loading forces, no one can be certain of that, and therefore the wall should be strengthened and repaired. The Praeger report does not say there is no danger.

5. Stratton says the report states that "We can fix it up so that the cracks are gone." *Not true.* The report states clearly that the wall will continue to crack even after their recommended procedures.

6. Stratton says the existing bracing is a "public relations gimmick." *Not true.* The visible bracing is primarily at the portico and the Praeger report agrees with the necessity for the bracing to prevent the collapse of the portico. The portico is not the wall.

7. Detailed study indicates a thickset of unknowns that can never be adequately penetrated. An attempt to restore the wall will lead to endless maintenance and repair at no predictable cost limitation, as indicated by the Praeger report itself in its factual portions.

COMMENTS ON THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL DISCUSSION

There are some basic facts about which there is no substantive or actual disagreement.

Fact No. 1: The wall must be strengthened in some way, either by an attempt to do so in its present position or by a positive method of buttressing through additional laterally placed walls that will be part of an extension. Prior information and the Praeger report substantiate this.

Fact No. 2: The existing wall, if an extension is provided, will not be disturbed. It will remain in place and continue to be partially exposed on the interior as is the old East Front original wall.

Fact No. 3: The design of the extension is a virtual reproduction of the existing appearance, is not a point of contention by architects, and, in anything, is viewed by experts in classical architectural design as an improvement and an enhancement of the basic appearance of the Capitol from the west. This results from the original design having been related to the old, small, low dome, rather than the existing dome which was added in 1865.

Fact No. 4: The proposed extension will reproduce the existing classical details at all points where it can be done, as was done on the East Front, in order to recreate the original design insofar as possible.

Fact No. 5: The existing terraces will be disturbed only in part and will be extended in accordance with the extension of the wall itself, and, again will reproduce the existing design insofar as possible.

Fact No. 6: The wall in question totals only 20% of the total exposed existing walls of the Capitol; thus 80% of the exterior of the building will not be disturbed in any way.

POSITIONS

The building itself—the Temple of Liberty—is the shrine to the American people and a symbol of freedom and democracy throughout the world. The dome, the wings, the steps on the East Front, the general appearance of the building as a unified whole, form the shrine that lives in the minds of people everywhere. The 20% of the exterior wall is not the shrine but is being made to appear so on the part of those whose sentiment brings them to believe that any disturbance to the building at all is a disturbance to the shrine. History tells an opposite story. There have been 15 separate and distinct changes to the bulk of the Capitol and countless changes and alterations, numbering into the hundreds, on the interior of the building. (See the attached list.) The history of the building has been one of continuous change and growth as the Nation has changed and grown and the needs of the Congress have similarly changed and grown.

At one time in the history of the Nation this single building housed the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, and all of the offices of all of the Senators and all of the Congressmen. The space demands gradually forced the removal of the Supreme Court in 1935, the Library of Congress in 1898, and the working offices of the Senate and the House into buildings which now form the Capitol Hill complex. There remains in the building, especially on the House side, the dire need for space in proximity to the legislative chambers for those supportive functions of the legislative process that are a necessary part of the legislative process. Not only do the separate branches of the legislature require supportive offices of their own, but the legislative process has evolved an increasing number of joint conferences and other joint Senate-House activities which are requiring increasing volumes of space close to the legislative chambers. These space requirements are increasing year by year.

The Praeger report contains a number of ambiguities which are resolved in favor of strengthening the existing wall in its present location instead of buttressing with the walls of an extension. There is no doubt that the wall can be strengthened in some fashion in that way. The body and substance of the re-

port do not substantiate some of the opinions which are presented in the form of conclusion to the report. A great many ambiguities are apparent as one reads the details and supportive information in the report itself. These unknowns and ambiguities can lead to a quicksand of entrapment in terms of the final possible cost of restoring the wall in place.

A real question exists as to whether an expenditure of \$20 to \$30 million to repair the wall and get no usable space in return is a valid expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The differential between the cost of \$20 to \$30 million and the cost of the extension, which is estimated at \$50 to \$60 million, will result in the creation of 270,000 gross square feet of space so that the citizens of this Nation will receive something tangible in return for the expenditure of their funds. We must concern ourselves primarily with what will best serve the people of this Nation. The needs of their elected representatives to enable them to properly conduct the legislative process will be served through the expenditure of public funds to provide necessary space. The people will not be served through an expenditure of 20 or 30 millions of dollars which will result in a repaired, patched, painted wall in the Capitol of the greatest Nation on earth.

If we were discussing the building as a whole, the people undoubtedly would want funds to be spent for the preservation of this Shrine of Democracy. But we are not talking here about the building as a whole. We are talking merely about a piece of wall. That kind of sentiment for this living, working building, which is part museum and visited by millions of Americans every year, and yet is an active legislative business building, must be placed on the scales against the tremendous need of the legislature for additional space. Our space needs will not diminish. They will increase as the population increases. We will need space in many ways, one of the most important of which is space in proximity to the legislative chambers.

The need for continued repair and maintenance to the wall, if it remains in place as an exterior wall of the building, is indicated by the Praeger engineering report. The report states: "If the wall voids were filled, exterior cracking would be inhibited by transfer of stress to interior portions of the wall. Generally, however, cracking will continue to occur as the wall adjusts to temperature change." The report then recommends a series of control joints which, in theory, are supposed, but not guaranteed, to control the locations of the cracks. The report then says, "With these measures future cracking should occur at a much reduced rate." This is an example of numerous places in the report where an opinion is expressed which leaves the decisionmakers to live with the result in the event that the opinion is not borne out by future experience.

It will be noted that the report does not say future cracking will not occur, nor does it say that future cracking will be reduced. It merely says future cracking should occur at a much reduced rate.

The question of condensation on the interior wall is examined in only a very cursory fashion in the report and leaves a great measure of doubt as to the future needs for maintenance and repairs as interior plaster may become damaged from moisture. The appendix to the recent AIA report indicates a similar concern for this problem.

Continuous painting of the wall forever into the future is recommended by the report, not only as a preservative method but also to cover the blemishes that will occur in the wall as a result of the repair process that the report recommends. The report says, "Effective grouting will require relatively close spacing of drill holes vertically and horizontally in the upper walls." These holes are recommended to be drilled every three feet in both directions. "This would increase

the need for the replacement stone required to obtain an unflawed surface, possibly in excess of that available in the East Front storage piles. For Scheme 2 this would mean either some proportion of artificial replacement stone, or toleration of a pock-marked appearance on a fairly regular grid. Under Scheme 1 this would be of no concern, since patch marks would be painted over."

The report also says, "Future damage by intrusion of moisture or paint can be controlled by the application of a stone preservative and joint sealer, a procedure which should be applied at regular intervals."

The report thus indicates that the restoration will, at the very best, be a patchwork process with a result that requires continuous maintenance and painting in order for the appearance to approach the level of being satisfactory.

This is further indicated in the report by the statement that the removal of the existing paint, some of which is an eighth of an inch in thickness, cannot be accomplished without damage to the existing stone. "The experience gained by the test removal of paint, performed as part of this study, indicates that it will not be possible to completely remove the paint and paint stain without some damage to the stone."

The report contains several gratuitous opinions of a non-engineering nature, which indicate a bias that raises the question of credibility with regard to the report's conclusions, especially since the broad conclusions do not appear to follow the weight of the evidence in the body of the report.

The following quotations are examples: "Some stones are so far eroded that they should be replaced but others, less seriously deteriorated, may be tolerated as an expected sign of age. . . . The Capitol is 150 years old and should give an impression of venerable age, not a crisp newness that denies its historical background." Neither of these are opinions in areas in which the engineering firm holds itself out to be competent. They appear to be added in order to rationalize some preconceived notions.

The body of the report states, "A cost plus contract with an 'upset price' seems more realistic and could be obtained on a competitive basis." Thus, although the report concludes that a competitive lumpsum fixed price construction bid or bids can be obtained, it nevertheless recommends that the work should not be accomplished on that basis.

The entire question of cost is thus left wide open. Even the AIA report says, "It would be impossible for anyone at this stage of study to guarantee a total restoration cost." The AIA report also says, "The Task Force recognizes that the work could be done on a competitive, lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids but we feel that competitive bidding for a fixed profit and overhead with the work being done on a cost basis should be strongly considered in the same way the White House restoration was accomplished."

The appendix to the AIA report makes the following statement in commenting on the Praeger report: "There is discussion of the thermal effect of solidification of the wall resulting from the infilling of the present cavity. This phenomenon is not discussed in great detail other than to conclude that there is to be predicted a 10% net increase in heat gain or heat loss in the solidified wall. The effect of this change in the internal structure of walls of such comparatively great mass bears closer investigation. It is probable that it will require an interval of time, perhaps 18 months to 2 years, for the long stabilized thermal and hydro balance within the walls to become re-established, responsive to modifications resulting from the filling of the voids and the possible modification in the reverse permeability or breathing property of the wall."

In further comments, the appendix to the AIA report states, "It is difficult to accept the categorical statement that 'condensation in the wall will not occur during the summer'. The computations on Figure 22 do not appear to indicate a recognition of the lag in change of the ambient humidity and temperature of the internal wall volume and it is possibly questionable whether the conclusions shown thereon are valid without further experimental documentation."

Thus, we find that even those who support the Praeger report find serious difficulties in accepting it in toto. If one examines the report objectively and one recognizes the responsibility of having to face the future with the possibilities of future difficulties and additional repairs and, thus, additional costs, in the saving of the wall, then one must conclude that these factors will lead the Congress into a thicket of unending difficulties with the wall if it should decide to try to save it. That circumstance, coupled with the dire need for space, will bring any dispassionate, reasonable man to the conclusion that an extension to the United States Capitol will best serve the people of this Nation.

1. Original North Wing:
Begun 1793—completed 1800.
Senate occupied from 1800—1859.
House occupied 1800—1801, 1804—1807.
Supreme Court occupied 1801—1935.
Library of Congress occupied 1800—1824.
2. 2-story Senate Chamber converted to separate stories with Supreme Court occupying lower chamber from 1810—1860.
3. Temporary structure at location of Statuary Hall occupied by House from 1801—1804.
4. South Wing completed in 1807. Occupied by House 1807—1857.
5. Both North and South Wings (and 1-story wooden connecting passageway) burned in 1814 and reconstruction was completed in 1819.
6. Central Section begun in 1818 and completed in 1829. Library of Congress occupied 2 stories of West Central Front 1824—1897. Altered to provide office spaces after 1897.
7. Present Senate and House Wings begun in 1851 and completed in 1859.
8. Old low dome replaced from 1856—1865.
9. West Central section reconstructed following a fire in 1851.
10. Terraces on North, South and West added 1884—1892.
11. Gas explosion in old North Wing required reconstruction in 1898.
12. Original wood roof construction replaced with steel and concrete in 1902.
13. Cast iron and glass skylights over both Chambers from 1857—1949 replaced from 1949—1951.
14. East Front extension constructed 1958—1962.
15. Interior alterations and changes 1958—1972.

COMMISSION FOR EXTENSION OF THE U.S. CAPITOL—MARCH 8, 1972

Whereas Public Law 91-145, approved December 12, 1969, provides:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

For an additional amount for "Extension of the Capitol", \$2,275,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol as authorized by law: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing appropriation as may be necessary shall be used for emergency shoring and repairs of, and related work on, the west central front of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the employment of independent non-governmental engineering and other necessary services for studying and reporting (within six months after the date of the employment contract) on the feasibility and cost of restoring such west central front

under such terms and conditions as the Commission may determine: *Provided, however*, That pending the completion and consideration of such study and report, no further work toward extension of such west central front shall be carried on: *Provided further*, That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: *Provided further*, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol.

Whereas, the restoration feasibility and cost study and report of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Consulting Engineers-Architects, made pursuant to Public Law 91-145, was considered by the Commission at its meeting of March 8, 1972, in Room EF-100 of the Capitol; and

Whereas, the Commission established to its satisfaction that all five of the conditions specified in Public Law 91-145, relating to restoration, cannot be met: Now, therefore, be it resolved,

That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby directed to proceed with the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front in accord with Plan 2 heretofore approved by the Commission.

CARL ALBERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman; HALE BOGGS, Majority Leader of the House; GERALD R. FORD, Minority Leader of the House; SPIRO T. AGNEW, President of the Senate; MIKE MANSFIELD, Majority Leader of the Senate; HUGH SCOTT, Minority Leader of the Senate; GEORGE M. WHITE, Architect of the Capitol.

LEGISLATION GOVERNING EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT

(Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, Public Law 88-248, 88th Congress and Public Law 91-77, 91st Congress)

Extension of the Capitol: The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized, under the direction of a Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, to provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States

Capitol in substantial accordance with scheme B of the architectural plan submitted by a joint commission of Congress and reported on March 3, 1905 (House Document numbered 385, Fifty-eighth Congress), but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol Grounds, together with utilities, equipment, approaches, and other appurtenant or necessary items, as may be approved by said Commission, and for such purposes there is hereby appropriated \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by said Commission to be required for the purposes hereof: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of said Commission and without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act and, prior to any appropriations being provided for extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the west central portion of the United States Capitol, to obligate such sums as may be necessary for the employment of nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services and for test borings and other necessary incidental items required to make a survey, study and examination of the structural condition of such west central portion, to make reports of findings, and to make recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary, including the feasibility of corrective measures in conjunction with extension of such west central portion."

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 10, 1972]

WHITE'S RIGHT VOTE

When the late J. George Stewart was the non-architect Architect of the Capitol, that anachronism was widely blamed for Stewart's persistent campaign to extend the west side of the U.S. Capitol rather than patch up its eroded surface.

"Fire Stewart!" was the battle cry in those days, the argument being that no real architect would for a moment support such a project.

Thus, upon Stewart's death in 1970, his replacement predictably turned out to be an impeccably credentialed professional. George M. White, the new man, was not only a respected former vice president of the American Institute of Architects, he had personally shared—before taking on the new job—that outfit's objections to any alteration in the dimensions of the Capitol. So what's happened?

Well, after more than a year's day-to-day exposure to the needs and realities of the Capitol, Architect White joined the House and Senate leadership this week in voting unanimously to proceed with an addition that will reproduce precisely the architectural features of the present worn-out west front and provide, in the process, a lot of space for some essential facilities the Capitol now lacks.

And, also predictably, a few strident voices now are calling for White's resignation. But most of the steam by now has gone out of this tired old refrain, and it's high time. White's decision was not, as the charge goes, a cave-in to political pressures. It springs from a wealth of exposure to facts he did not have a year ago, and which most of his critics still do not have.

Among the things he came to realize, White says, was that "the Capitol is not a museum." Indeed it is not. It is the workshop of Congress. As such, the Capitol's entire history during the past century and a half has been one of constant change and growth, accommodating to Congress' chang-

ing needs and paralleling—if one chooses to look at it that way—the growth of the nation itself.

The marvel is that this sequence of changes—some, in the earlier days, involving drastic architectural modification—invariably has added to rather than detracted from the allure and symbolic magnificence of the beloved old building, while keeping pace with Congress' urgent space requirements.

That tradition was scrupulously upheld in the controversial extension of the Capitol's east front a dozen or so years ago. It will be, as well, by the project on the west which White rightly endorsed this week.

THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1972.

Memorandum to the members of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol:

The primary purpose of this meeting is the consideration by the Commission of the January, 1971 report of the firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Consulting Engineers and Architects, relating to the feasibility and cost of the restoration of the West Central Front of the Capitol, as proposed in such report.

Under the prevailing statute providing for this report, the Commission is charged with the responsibility of establishing to its satisfaction whether the five conditions specified in the law are met.

If the Commission determines that the five conditions are *not* met, then the law provides that the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending the West Central Front in accord with Plan 2 which the Commission has heretofore approved.

If the Commission concludes that the five conditions are met, then the law provides that the Commission shall make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the front.

LAW RELATING TO THESE DETERMINATIONS

In the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970; (Public Law 91-145), the Congress simultaneously appropriated \$2,000,000 for preparation of final contract drawings and specifications for carrying out Plan 2 for extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol and \$250,000 for engineering and other necessary services for studying and reporting on the feasibility and cost of restoring the front.

The law provided that pending the completion and consideration of the restoration study and report, no further work toward extension was to be undertaken.

The law also contained the following provisions which are pertinent to your consideration today:

"That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

"(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

"(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

"(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lump sum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

"(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

"(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not

exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: *Provided further*, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinbefore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol."

Upon direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, after exhaustive study, the engineering contract for the restoration study was awarded to Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, Engineers-Architects of New York City, on July 1, 1970.

The Praeger report was received at the end of December, 1970, and was forwarded immediately to all Members of the Commission and released to the press and others interested.

STATEMENT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL RELATING TO HIS STUDY OF THE WEST FRONT PROBLEM

Early last year, as the newly appointed Architect of the Capitol, and in anticipation that the Commission in Charge, before reaching a conclusion on the matter, would seek my professional judgment in assisting them to evaluate the Praeger report, I began a detailed professional review of all available information relating to the history and development of the West Central Front proposals.

Among the activities in which I engaged during the review are the following:

1. A careful and diligent open-minded study of the Praeger report.

2. A physical examination of both the interior and the exterior of the original west walls.

3. A careful review of testimony given over a period of many years before various House and Senate Committees concerned with the proposals for the extension of the West Front of the Capitol, and before the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

4. A reading and review of the record of the floor debates in both the Senate and the House that led to the various actions of the Congress.

5. A review of the legislation, committee reports, and other documents on the subject.

6. Study of the Mueser, Rutledge, Wentworth & Johnston engineering report of 1957.

7. Study of the 1964 engineering report of The Thompson & Lichtner Co., Inc.

8. A study of the various reports of the former Architect of the Capitol, as well as reports made to him by the Associate Architects for the Extension Project.

9. Meetings and discussions of the various past studies, and of the Praeger report, with the staff of the Architect of the Capitol.

10. Requested and received advice and counsel from the American Institute of Architects which responded by appointing a new Task Force to re-examine the AIA position. We engaged in several conferences and a written report from the Task Force was received.

11. Asked three prominent general contractors, an officer and members of the AGC, for their opinion with regard to estimates of cost as outlined in the Praeger report and the feasibility of obtaining competitive, lumpsum bids.

12. Conversed at some length with Mr. E. H. Praeger himself in order that I might obtain verbal clarification of a number of what I considered to be ambiguous or contradicting portions of the written report.

13. Conferred with the Advisory Architects, Consulting Engineers, and others.

14. Conferred with other individuals who have maintained a long interest in the Capitol, including Senators, Congressmen, and design professionals.

15. Spoke with a British stone preservation expert who inspected the Capitol, and then read several of his papers regarding the

deterioration of stone generally and in England in particular.

16. Inspected, at no cost to the Government, several European restoration projects.

17. Personally examined the space needs of the House of Representatives and, to some degree, the space needs of the Senate. Have explored all areas on the House Side of the Capitol, from the basement through the attic, and many of the Senate areas. Several discussions have been held with Senator Jordan about my proceeding with a full space study of Senate facilities and he has now approved my proceeding with that study.

18. Examined and studied the matter of how the Congress uses the building, how the public (visitors) also uses the building, and further, how their respective and simultaneous needs must be considered.

19. Spent untold hours in review of the various data and in the reading of articles by many persons concerned with preservation, planning, the history of the Capitol, and in the re-examination of the Praeger report.

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS OF THE ARCHITECT

After these many months of study and investigation, I am prepared to offer the following professional judgments, which for the purposes of this brief presentation have been necessarily simplified:

1. The structural adequacy of the west wall is, in fact, indeterminate. As many experts will declare that it is stable as will say that it is unstable. But even those who support the position of stability admit to the indeterminacy of the loading computations, and, therefore, say that the wall should be strengthened as an insurance against the probability of a possible failure. Thus, although there appears to be no imminent danger of an immediate collapse, there may well be concentrations of forces that have accumulated through structural and other changes over the years and that could, under certain circumstances, be triggered and released. There appears, then, to be no basic disagreement regarding the need to strengthen, and thus stabilize the wall in some fashion. Further, there appears to be no disagreement that this goal may be achieved in at least two ways, one of which is through restoration, or a strengthening of the wall in situ, and another of which is through an extension of the building itself, which will, in effect, buttress and thus strengthen the wall.

2. There appears to be no disagreement with regard to the exterior appearance of the proposed extension, nor any disagreement with regard to the total appearance of the Capitol that would result.

3. That human characteristic which manifests itself in our desire to save and preserve at least some of our heritage, whether it be personal, national, or international, finds a high degree of intensity in some, and it may then be expressed in the feeling that preservation is a primary goal in and of itself. I submit that the intensity with which that desire exists in the spectrum of people's feelings must, in this instance, be weighed against some of the physical needs of the Congress that must be met. If the Congress, for example, were to commission the design of a new legislative complex, the designers would undoubtedly need to assist in the writing of a program which would describe the physical needs of the Congress in the transaction of its daily business. The configuration of the building or buildings would arise from a study of these needs. In this existing legislative building, viz., the Capitol, these needs have changed and expanded over the years, and, indeed, are continuing to do so.

It is apparent that complex problems such as these are not generally capable of simple solutions. Recognizing that it may thus be an oversimplification to so state, it is nevertheless my opinion that the Congress must weigh the sentiment of preservation against

its physical needs, taking into account the various alternative methods of providing needed space in close proximity to the legislative chambers.

4. The argument can be made that the fact that the West Front contains the last remaining exposed original wall, is indicative of the past life and hence the growth of this living, working symbol of democracy and freedom that is the Capitol. Sometime, of course, acceleration in the growth of our Nation may diminish and perhaps that point is already in sight. It has therefore been suggested that the existing physical outline of the Capitol be considered inviolate at its present location. Somewhere that position must surely be taken, but it appears that it is not necessarily valid to presume that it cannot be taken at some other location, such as, for example, that of the proposed extension.

5. The final cost of the proposed restoration appears to be indeterminate. Most experts feel that the cost will certainly be more than \$15,000,000, notwithstanding the written statement in the Praeger report. The requirements of items 3 and 4 of Public Law 91-145, previously quoted, indicated that a lumpsum contract for restoration of not more than \$15,000,000 must be capable of being obtained. I interpret these two items, taken together, as meaning that the Congress has set a fixed, limited, i.e., maximum, cost of \$15,000,000 as one of the criteria for the feasibility of restoration. Experience in the construction of buildings indicates that a lumpsum contract, in and of itself, is not an assurance that the designated sum will indeed be the final cost. It is my considered professional opinion, based upon my recent investigations as outlined above, that the restoration, as proposed, cannot be accomplished for a total final cost of \$15,000,000. In that connection, it is important to recognize that even though the cost per square foot of an extension might appear to be high because of the particular kind of construction that would be necessary, any expenditure for restoration, because no space would be added, would result in what mathematically results in an infinite cost per square foot.

It is, further, worthy of note that there is no disagreement among the advocates of the various positions that restoration work generally, and the West Front of the Capitol in particular, should, because of its specialized nature, be accomplished through the medium of a cost plus a fixed fee contract rather than through a lumpsum agreement obtained on a competitive bid basis.

Although the specifics of the other three provisions of Public Law 91-145 can generally be said to be capable of being met, with the obvious possibility for disagreement regarding what is "safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future", I believe that it would be inappropriate to presume that the cost limitation can or could be met.

SUMMARY

Summarizing, then, I submit the following judgments: (a) although it is relatively stable, the west wall needs repair and strengthening; (b) the restoration method of strengthening the wall cannot be accomplished for a guaranteed cost limit of \$15,000,000; (c) the Congress must weigh and decide upon the relative importance and the appropriate methods of providing for its space needs in the Capitol, as compared with the admittedly highly desirable goal of preserving the exposed physical wall.

Additional information will be available at the meeting of the Commission.

GEORGE M. WHITE,
Architect of the Capitol.

GEORGE M. WHITE

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, November 1, 1920. Four children: Stephanie 19, Jocelyn

18, Geoffrey 17, and Pamela 14. Holds the degrees of Master of Science and Bachelor of Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1941). Master of Business Administration from the Graduate School of Business of Harvard University (1948); Bachelor of Laws from Case Western Reserve (1959). He is a Registered Architect in Ohio, a Registered Professional Engineer in Ohio and Massachusetts, a member of the Ohio Bar, and certified by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, and the National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners.

A former electronics design engineer and assistant division manager, Electronics Dept., General Electric Company (1946), he has practiced as an architect and as a consulting engineer since 1948.

Former member of the Faculty in Physics and in Architecture at Case Western Reserve University.

A Fellow of the American Institute of Architects, he is a former A.I.A. Vice President and Board Member; Member and former Chairman of the A.I.A. Documents Board and Insurance Committee; Chairman of A.I.A. Task Forces on Structure, on Professional Liability Insurance, and on Labor Liaison; member of the National Panel of Arbitrators of the American Arbitration Association, the National Society of Professional Engineers, the American Bar Association, and the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. Awarded the Gold Medal of the Architect's Society of Ohio.

Author of numerous articles on Professional Liability, Professional Corporations, and Construction Law.

President, Director, and Trustee of several real estate development organizations; President of Whitecliff Inc., a 100 bed extended care facility; Chairman of the Board of Merriman Holbrook, Inc., a marine hardware manufacturer.

Appointed Architect of the Capitol in January 1971.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the essence of a letter to the editor that provides in part the answers to some questions raised by the Washington Post.

To the Editor of the Washington Post:

It seems to me that your editorial "Obstinate Vandals on Capitol Hill" is most unfortunate, inaccurate, and highly misleading. The editorial appears calculated only to inflame—not to inform. It is the same old refrain such as experienced in former years. One must conclude that all objectivity has been wrung from your editorial policy on the West Front matter. The editorial reflects a closed mind—"None so blind as those who will not see".

It is amazing that you characterize the Commission's unanimous decision as "an arrogant maneuver of dubious legality". One assumes that your editorial writer is capable of reading and understanding the very clear language of the governing statute—language which I might say was inserted at the request of those sponsoring restoration:

"That after submission of such (restoration) study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission: (1) That * * * (emphasis supplied)

and then the five well-publicized conditions to be met by restoration are stated in the law.

The entire membership of the Commission met on March 8, 1972, considered the report, and established to its satisfaction that all of the five conditions specified could not be met. It therefore unanimously directed the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with the preparation of final plans for the extension,

precisely as mandated by the statute. When a Commission of Congress carries out the responsibilities placed upon it by Act of Congress, how can any fair and reasonable editor charge arrogance and dubious legality?

Your criticism of the design of the approved extension is indicative of your frantic state of mind insofar as this project is concerned. Even the various groups from the American Institute of Architect who have reviewed the plans have had no objection to the design. The American Registered Architect's Society has endorsed the design.

How long will you continue to mislead your readers by such worn out and inaccurate statements as the extenders would "bury the last remaining external vestiges of the Capitol as it was originally designed and built. William Thornton's softly elegant sandstone facade is the only visible link to the Capitol's beginning . . ." This makes me chuckle just a bit. I am sure your writer knows (or he should know) that Dr. Thornton's "softly elegant sandstone" has not been seen for over 160 years. What one sees is the old cracked stones, patched up over the years, and buried under numerous coats of grey paint—yes, paint, not softly elegant sandstone. Dr. Thornton's work (as changed by Architects Bulfinch and Latrobe) have not been seen for many generations. If you wish to see how "elegant" this old sandstone is, I invite you to examine Plate 1 in the restoration report, showing the messy and miserable appearance of the old stone once the paint is removed.

The Olmstead terraces will be ruined? Not at all, in fact, changes to them will hardly be noticeable and they will become even more expansive and more beautiful with the magnificent new front as a backdrop. The American Society of Landscape Architects should know about such things. They reviewed the plans and had no objections. In fact, they assisted the Architect by making several helpful suggestions.

The perspective of the dome, far from being hurt, will be enhanced by the new front with its central pediment.

Relative to the five conditions which the restoration study was required to meet: although the restoration report contains a passing, general statement "Further, the restoration can be accomplished within the guidelines set forth by Congress", the same report contained the following qualification in another part of the report:

"The third Commission condition stipulates that 'restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive bid or bids'. A cost plus contract with an 'upset price' seems more realistic and could be obtained on a competitive basis."

This language indicates that even those who prepared the restoration report did not believe a competitive lumpsum contract was feasible, although they, in effect, had previously stated otherwise in their general statement. We all know that the only meaningful competition on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract is on the fixed fee itself (perhaps 10% of the contract) and even that figure is usually subject to adjustment if unknowns are encountered.

Since the Commission's decision, I have had the opportunity to discuss the five conditions with George White, the Architect of the Capitol, who is an eminently qualified architect and engineer. He advised me that, in his professional judgment (after studying the project for over a year), the two requirements relating to the cost and lumpsum bid features could not be met and he also doubts that the requirement relating to safety, soundness, durability and beauty could be met to any great degree. Therefore, it is his judgment that only two out of five conditions could probably be met.

But he also informs me that his recommendation in favor of extension was founded

on a much broader basis than the five conditions. That basis is "what solution would best serve the people of the United States", and on that question, he felt compelled by sound planning and good judgment to vote in favor of extension.

You conclude that the crumbling west wall is now proven to be a myth by the restoration report. If that is so, then why does the restoration report state that "a structural restoration program is required"? If the poor condition of the west wall is a myth, why spend more than \$15,000,000 on it?

I sincerely believe the Commission and the Architect have made the right decision and I would express the hope that you would now appreciate and respect that decision although you previously espoused restoration. I have noted with much satisfaction the editorial favorable to the extension in the Washington Evening Star and I invite you to join us in carrying forward the now approved extension.

A unanimous decision of the Leaders of the Congress, from both the Senate and House and from both sides of the aisles, plus the Vice President and the Architect of the Capitol, deserves support—not condemnation.

FRED SCHWENGEL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, today the House takes up the first appropriation bill for fiscal 1973. By it we give the executive branch new obligational authority.

Are we putting the cart before the horse? Have we adopted a budget for the Government for the ensuing year? Have we matched spending plans with revenue, and made decisions as to what shall be done about the difference? The answer is "No."

Even the smallest business firm and the smallest municipality adopts a budget before it starts spending money for the coming business year.

Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives is given the purse strings of Government, but at no time from one end of the year to the other does the House adopt a budget.

Instead we receive the President's budget recommendations, make no decision whatever on them, but instead start appropriating money piecemeal.

It is, of course, human nature, and therefore the nature of the House, to avoid grasping the nettle of difficult decisions. No Member relishes voting for less spending, for high taxes. We are not eager to vote up or down a resolution which contains the entire fiscal picture for the ensuing year—the revenue forecast, a limit on obligational authority to be granted by means of the various appropriation bills and resolutions, whether measures are needed for added revenue, and/or higher debt ceiling. Certainly, during my 12 years, the House has never faced squarely prior to the commencement of a fiscal year the entire budget picture.

By this neglect the House has effectively let the purse strings slip from its hands, placing the executive branch more effectively in the driver's seat.

The fiscal situation has truly become hypercritical as noted in the letter we all received 2 days ago from Chairman

MAHON. In stark terms he pictured the crisis that is upon us. I wish he had gone on to spell out a remedy, or even propose a step or two out of the tangle.

Nevertheless we should all be grateful to the chairman for this information. It helps to focus attention on the problem. And certainly recognition of a problem is the first essential before a solution is found.

I have a suggestion to make, and I speak of it at this particular time because if my suggestion were acted upon the House could not in today's circumstances consider this appropriation today.

My proposal is a rule change under which the House could not consider any appropriation bill for the ensuing fiscal year until it has first adopted a resolution containing a House-authorized Federal budget for the year.

Here is the first part of the rule change I propose:

The Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after due study and review, including consideration of the economic report and budget recommendations of the President, report to the House a resolution containing a House-authorized Federal budget for the ensuing fiscal year not later than 60 days after both Presidential reports have been received.

The proposed budget shall include:

First. Estimated overall Federal receipts from all sources;

Second. The maximum aggregate amount to be granted in obligational authority for all purposes, together with a maximum amount for each appropriation bill or resolution;

Third. Specific recommendations as to adjustment in revenue measures and/or public debt level necessitated by a deficit or surplus, if such is shown by budget figures on aggregate expenditures and receipts.

The balance of the language deals with requirements for the appropriation bills and resolutions as they subsequently come forward. Its main provisions would require a two-thirds vote for the House to appropriate more obligational authority than provided in the House-approved Federal budget.

You will note the 60-day provision. This would give the subcommittees on appropriations approximately until March 1 to hold hearings on the President's budget. In some cases the hearings could be completed in that time. In other cases not. In all cases the subcommittees could come up with a well-educated estimate of appropriation requirements for the ensuing year and thus participate in an informed way with the Ways and Means Committee in developing the resolution containing the House-approved Federal budget.

The resolution would set an aggregate obligational authority limit for each subsequent appropriation bill. For example, it would set a limit for the legislative branch, the bill not before us.

After the adoption of the budget reso-

lution, the appropriations committee could then—and only then—bring forward for action the bill for the legislative branch. If the total figure in the bill did not exceed that in the House-approved Federal budget, the appropriation could be approved by a simple majority. If it was in excess, a two-thirds vote would be required.

Conference reports and continuing resolutions would be subject to the same provision.

The important difference would be that, unlike today, the House would have a solid, responsible point of reference when it began the appropriations process.

It would have decided the fundamental questions of appropriation ceilings, and the equally important question of how the funds required by these appropriations would be secured—how much by taxation, and how much by higher public debt; that is to say, inflation.

That, I suggest, is a businesslike, responsible way for us to proceed with our fiscal business. It holds the promise, I think, of curbing deficit financing.

Does my proposed rule change have a chance of acceptance? I have asked several of my colleagues, as well as members of the professional staff of the House, that question. I get little encouragement, even though all acknowledge that the present system is not working satisfactorily and something must be done.

One man, a professional of great experience, put it this way: "A lot of things, including this plan of yours, could be done—if there is the will. I am strongly inclined to believe the House lacks the will to make a reform of this magnitude."

Maybe so. Maybe this effort of mine is a waste of time. Maybe a better plan can be devised. I hope so. This is the best I have been able to come up with in consultation with perhaps a dozen others, but I am eager to scrap it in favor of a better approach.

Here is the full text of the rule change I propose:

RULE ON HOUSE-AUTHORIZED FEDERAL BUDGET

SEC. —(A) The Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after due study and review, including consideration of the economic report and budget recommendations of the President, report to the House a resolution containing a House-Authorized Federal Budget for the ensuing fiscal year not later than 60 days after both Presidential reports have been received.

The proposed budget shall include:

1. Estimated overall Federal receipts from all sources;
2. The maximum aggregate amount to be granted in obligatory authority for all purposes, together with a maximum amount for each appropriation bill or resolution;
3. Specific recommendations as to adjustment in revenue measures and/or public debt level necessitated by a deficit or surplus, if such is shown by budget figures on aggregate expenditures and receipts.

(B) No bill or resolution carrying appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year shall be in order for consideration by the House until the House-Authorized Federal Budget for such year has been approved.

The report on each such bill or resolution must include a statement in one of the following forms: "The provisions of this bill (or resolution) conform to the requirements of the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19— and will not cause it to be unbalanced in any respect. The bill (or resolution) as reported will appropriate \$—, and when this amount is deducted from \$—, the maximum amount for this appropriation bill (or resolution) under the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19—, the remaining balance is \$—." or—"The provisions of this bill (or resolution) do not conform to the requirements of the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19—. The bill (or resolution) as reported will appropriate \$—, and when this amount is deducted from \$—, the maximum amount for this appropriation bill (or resolution) under the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19—, a deficit results in the amount of \$—."

Any bill or resolution carrying appropriations whose report fails to include a statement in the first form shall require the approval of two-thirds of those Members present and voting, a quorum being present. This requirement shall not be waived or suspended.

(C) The joint statement of managers to accompany a report made by a committee of conference on a bill or resolution carrying appropriations shall include a statement in one of the following forms: "The provisions of this conference report conform to the requirements of the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19— and will not cause it to be unbalanced in any respect." or—"The provisions of this conference report do not conform to the requirements of the House-Authorized Federal Budget for fiscal 19—."

A conference report on a bill or resolution carrying appropriations which fails to include a statement in the first form shall require the approval of two-thirds of those Members present and voting, a quorum being present. This requirement shall not be waived or suspended.

During reading of today's bill, I will offer an amendment.

For obvious reasons, it deals only with a cut in spending. It has nothing to do with taxes. I am under no illusions about its fate. It will not be accepted. It would cut the appropriation by \$55 million—representing a cut of 14 percent below the President's budget request.

I offer it to focus attention on our budget problem, and to show how much surgery is needed to come up with a balanced budget in fiscal 1973. I am not suggesting that the best way to meet the entire budget problem is with the axe. Some cuts are necessary and certainly desirable, but we should also look at revenue. If we plan to keep on with the vast programs—even just those now on the books—we should be raising additional tax revenues, not cutting taxes.

But the sad fact is that we seem unlikely to do either. We are unlikely to raise taxes, and we are unlikely to cut spending much either.

That is why I have come to the conclusion that the rational, practical way to meet the problem is through a fundamental change in House rules of procedure, a change which will cause all Members to face up at one time at the beginning of the year to the broad interrelated questions of spending, revenue, debt, and inflation—and then make some decisions, before the actual spending process starts.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Illinois on the statement he is making and the proposal he has made. He is trying to bring some discipline into the fiscal affairs of the country.

I applaud the gentleman for his effort. I believe his proposal needs some refinement, and I do not approve all of it, but I do applaud the gentleman's efforts, and I hope he will continue them.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CASEY of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

LEADERSHIP AUTOMOBILES

For purchase, exchange, hire, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile for the Speaker, \$18,780.

For purchase, exchange, hire, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile for the majority leader of the House, \$18,780.

For purchase, exchange, hire, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile for the minority leader of the House, \$18,780.

The clerk read as follow:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 1 strike out lines 23, 24, and 25. On page 8 strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply deletes two of the three chauffeur-driven limousines provided for in this bill, the two assigned to the two floor leaders of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I have and have had for, I believe, about 4 or 5 years now a bill introduced here to eliminate all chauffeur-driven vehicles from the U.S. Government with the exception of one each for Cabinet members and so many as the President may require, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice, and the Vice President of the United States.

It was in March 1801 when a gentleman living close by the Capitol arose in his boarding house and dressed and went downstairs and had breakfast with the other boarders in the boarding house and then walked to the Capitol and was inaugurated as President of the United States.

Well, things have changed since Thomas Jefferson took office, and I think

we all realize as a practical matter the need for these automobiles in the case of certainly the President of the United States for his security. However, I must say where I come from and I suspect where everybody else comes from, when a person gets a car with his job the car has something to do with the job. I think it would be rather crowded on the floor to have two Cadillac limousines trying to maneuver around. I understand the floor leaders' jobs to be here on the floor. That is where their services are performed.

I offer this amendment with no enmity for my good friend from Michigan or my good friend from Louisiana and without any personal reference whatsoever.

Just as an example of what I think is spending that is unnecessary in the Federal Government, I think a public servant does not need a servant to drive him around or, if he does, maybe he is not in good enough shape to serve the public.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know why Thomas Jefferson walked to his inauguration, but I am sure the streets in Washington were much safer then than they are now.

However, I think it is a little ridiculous to say that we have cut out some other chauffeur-driven automobiles, so we should cut out these. I certainly think the two floor leaders here deserve the courtesy and the convenience, if you will, of having these cars, because they are certainly in need of them.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think this amendment would be a serious mistake. The work of the majority and minority leaders does not confine itself to the floor of the House of Representatives in the United States Capitol. It takes itself to many other places around this city. The demands on the majority and minority leaders are unbelievable. I think the least we can do to lighten their load as they try to carry out their legislative leadership responsibilities is to give them this kind of service so that they can cover the areas that need to be covered.

I know from personal experience and my contacts with the minority leader that it is almost an impossible job, and it is that way for the majority leader, too. They need this help.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. If the amendment now pending were to pass, would it still leave automobiles for some nonelected officials of the House like the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I just wonder. I agree they would be. The only thing is to pass

the bill that I am going to introduce, then, and I have a discharge petition pending with two signatures on it, which I introduced 12 months ago, so if the membership rejects this amendment, I hope they will expedite that bill by signing that petition.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How many names do you have on that discharge petition?

Mr. JACOBS. I said there are only two on it, which would get rid of all of the limousines throughout the Federal Government. So if anybody is interested in it, even if you do not have a limousine, you can make it down to the well and sign the petition.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman has made his contribution and we appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 29, after line 20, add the following: "Sec. 105. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 86 per cent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1973 (H. Doc. 215)."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, back in 1967 an amendment became quite prominent, and I must say quite popular, under the name of the Bow amendment, and, except for the percentage figures set forth in the language just read by the Clerk, the amendment now before us is identical with the Bow amendment.

At that time the percentage figure in the Bow amendment was 95 percent, the objective at that time being to reduce the expenditure for the ensuing fiscal year by 5 percent. The percentage figure set forth in this revised language, which is in my amendment, is 86 percent, meaning a reduction in expenditures in the ensuing fiscal year of 14 percent.

Why the difference? I came to the 14 percent figure as being the amount that would have to be deducted from each main element of the President's budget in order to bring the budget into balance.

I know if there is any discussion on this amendment it will be argued that this is a bare-bones appropriation bill, the salaries and almost everything in it are mandated by statute, required by law, and that if we are going to have an amendment like this it will necessitate cutting our salaries, cutting our staff, cutting a lot of very important and essential things. No doubt that is true. But, nevertheless, if we are serious about trying to find a way to balance the budget by cutting spending and spending alone, this is the magnitude of the cut that we have to be thinking about, because anything less, at least on an across-the-board basis, applied to every appropriation bill as we expect it to come forward, will simply not do the job.

Now, in all candor I do not expect this

amendment to be accepted. I doubt if a 5 percent amendment would be accepted. There is not the will to cut spending on this bill or any other appropriation bill. But, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), so dramatically presented to us by his letter of 2 days ago, we are confronted with a fiscal crisis, and the magnitude of it is such that we ought to be seriously considering doing something beyond what we have been doing the last year or so.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think we are all interested in holding the line on spending. I know that the gentleman is making a very dramatic speech about his concern, which is a concern that we all have.

Mr. FINDLEY. I like the gentleman's adjective.

Mr. CEDERBERG. As I stated before, the amounts that are in this bill are the results of other legislation that has been pending.

What was the gentleman's vote on the Congressional Reorganization Act?

Mr. FINDLEY. I believe I voted affirmatively on it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Through that we have gotten I do not know how many hundreds more employees.

Mr. FINDLEY. I might tell the gentleman that when the conference report on the tax cut came around last year, I voted "no." I do not know how the gentleman voted, but I voted "no."

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is not the question involved here.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think it is part of this problem.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How did the gentleman vote on the election reform?

Mr. FINDLEY. I voted for that. That is another expense.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is another expense, and a new office and additional expense for the General Accounting Office, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the clerk of the Senate.

The gentleman is making his pitch in the wrong place.

Mr. FINDLEY. This is the only place available.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman should do it before it gets here. It is too late when it gets here. You have to do it earlier.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is too late in a lot of places, like the public debt ceiling; that comes much too late, too. We are too late now, if we wish to make changes in individual appropriation bills to conform to an approved budget because we have had no budget resolution for the Federal Government.

We should have required the approval of a budget resolution and thus face squarely all the elements in the budget, and made a decision on it before we start appropriating moneys.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That requires a change in the Rules of the House.

Mr. FINDLEY. So we are way behind in a lot of respects.

My point is that we had better start

thinking about a different way to proceed if we are going to avoid a fiscal disaster.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not disagree with the gentleman in that regard.

Mr. FINDLEY. The other side of the coin is that if we are not going to be able to cut spending by 14 percent on every appropriation bill that comes before us this year, and wish nevertheless to achieve a balanced budget, we are going to have to think of where to get new revenue.

I do not know of any proposal that is under active consideration now to rescind tax cuts that were voted last year or impose new revenue measures.

I would hate to see the House delay another year.

Does the gentleman agree with me that it would be wise for us to adopt a Federal budget before we appropriate any money?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to see something done in that area if it can possibly be worked out. I talked with the gentleman privately about that matter.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I talked with the gentleman about that in the office and raised that question about this in the budget.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, the goal that the gentleman from Illinois seeks is a commendable one. We all wish we could find some way to get ourselves out of this financial dilemma. But, I would point out—even if we should adopt this amendment, I do not know who would administer it because this branch of Government is not like, let us say, the Department of Agriculture where you have one department. There are a number of different segments of the legislative branch and there is no possible way that you can intelligently—or unintelligently—administer this proposal unless we just limit it to certain items.

Many of the items are of a mandatory nature that have to be done. Although the gentleman's idea is a commendable one—there is no way it can possibly be administered.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

This same point was brought up when Mr. Bow offered this amendment 6 years ago.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Was that to this bill?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes—to this very bill. His response was—Well, somebody put together the bill that is now before us and there must have been some authority to bring the pieces together. His presumption was that that same authority might deal with the cutting process.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. You mean this committee, for instance?

Mr. FINDLEY. Whatever authority put together the piece of legislation that came in the budget request.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel justified in rising in opposition to this amendment, because if my memory serves me correctly—I voted for very few, if any, of the so-called Bow amendments. I do not believe in a meat axe approach to budget cutting. I believe in a selective approach.

In the 20 years that I have served as a Member of the House, I never once presumed to lecture my colleagues and I shall not do that today.

As a normal human I have no corner on morality and I make no such claim. But nevertheless I do think it is time the House took a look at the way it has been conducting itself in recent years.

I am reminded of the line from Hamlet, "The lady doth protest too much me thinks."

I am wondering why in recent years we seem to assume a massive sense of guilt about everything that we do. The finger of accusation is pointed at the House of Representatives and we assume the burden to prove we are not dishonest.

Last year we passed a bill to prove we are not political crooks regarding campaign expenditures.

It was a good idea and I voted for it. But in our haste to prove ourselves innocent we passed a bill which almost no one understands. Our pell-mell rush to prove that the Congress of the United States was not a composite of crooks produced an ambiguous piece of legislation.

My father always used to say to me, "Think highly of yourself and then try to live up to it."

I think it is about time that we, the Members of Congress, start thinking of just what we are and what we represent. I have told many people in my congressional district that I will take any 435 people that anybody wants to pick coming out of any church any place in the United States on any Sunday morning, and the level of integrity and honesty of the Congress of the United States will be above those 435.

This is a great body which makes the decisions which determine the future of mankind. It is a responsible and important body that needs no defense.

Do you realize that not more than 11,000 men and women in the history of the United States have ever been privileged to serve as Members of Congress and have been given that honor? I think we have a right to feel proud of what we are.

Yes, we make mistakes because we are human. But they are honest mistakes. And I think it is about time that by our actions on the floor of the House we stop saying in effect "We are guilty."

Let us appropriate the money that is required to run this legislative branch. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I am somewhat intrigued with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, but I would like to make some legislative record

briefly. If the amendment is adopted, and a 14-percent reduction is required, I would hope that it would not come out of the payment to widows and heirs of deceased Members, or the Office of the Chaplain, or the books for the blind, or the medical supplies for the attending physician, or the Capitol Police, or the power supply for the Capitol, at the very least. There probably are other items that I could mention.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, guilt or no guilt, honest or dishonest, this Government is spending money that it does not have as represented by the \$40 billion deficit in this fiscal year of 1972 and the projected built-in budget deficit of \$25.5 billion for fiscal 1973. And if there is anyone in this House who believes it will end with a \$25.5 billion deficit, that individual has another guess coming.

I am going to support the gentleman's amendment, and it is strong medicine—but strong medicine is necessary these days if ever we are going to correct this situation of going head-over-heels deeper and deeper into debt each year. I am going to support the gentleman's amendment, but I can inform the gentleman from Illinois here and now that I am not going to support the new international organization he is sponsoring, and which is going to cost a lot of money if it is approved.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I guess a more pertinent question will be, will the gentleman support my proposed rules change under which the House can adopt a resolution with a House-approved Federal budget in it before we can appropriate any money? Does the gentleman feel that that would be a constructive step forward?

Mr. GROSS. I will support any proposal put before the House that brings some kind of order out of the financial chaos that confronts this country.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13995) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 9, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—363

Abernethy	Corman	Hansen, Wash.
Abourezk	Cotter	Harrington
Abzug	Coughlin	Harsha
Adams	Crane	Harvey
Addabbo	Culver	Hathaway
Anderson, Calif.	Daniel, Va.	Hawkins
Anderson, Tenn.	Danielson	Hébert
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Hechler, W. Va.
Annunzio	Davis, S.C.	Heckler, Mass.
Archer	Dellenback	Heinz
Arends	Dellums	Helstoski
Ashley	Denholm	Henderson
Aspin	Dennis	Hicks, Mass.
Badillo	Dewinski	Hicks, Wash.
Baker	Devine	Hillis
Barrett	Dickinson	Hogan
Begich	Diggs	Holifield
Bell	Dingell	Horton
Bennett	Donohue	Hosmer
Bergland	Dorn	Howard
Betts	Downing	Hungate
Bevill	Drinan	Hunt
Biaggi	Duncan	Hutchinson
Blester	du Pont	Ichord
Bingham	Eckhardt	Jacobs
Blackburn	Edmondson	Jarman
Blanton	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Calif.
Blatnik	Edwards, Calif.	Jones
Boggs	Eilberg	Jones, Ala.
Boland	Erlenborn	Jones, N.C.
Bolling	Esch	Jones, Tenn.
Brademas	Evans, Colo.	Karth
Brasco	Evins, Tenn.	Kastenmeier
Bray	Fascell	Kazen
Brinkley	Fish	Keating
Brooks	Fisher	Kee
Broomfield	Flood	Keith
Brotzman	Flowers	King
Brown, Mich.	Flynt	Koch
Brown, Ohio	Foley	Leggett
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	Lennon
Broyhill, Va.	Ford	Lent
Buchanan	William D.	Link
Burke, Fla.	Forsythe	Lloyd
Burke, Mass.	Fountain	Long, La.
Burleson, Tex.	Fraser	Long, Md.
Burlison, Mo.	Frelinghuysen	Lujan
Burton	Frenzel	McClory
Byrne, Pa.	Frey	McCloskey
Byrnes, Wis.	Gallagher	McClure
Byron	Garmatz	McCollister
Cabell	Gettys	McCormack
Caffery	Gialmo	McCulloch
Carey, N.Y.	Gibbons	McDade
Carney	Goldwater	McDonald
Carter	Gonzalez	Mich.
Casey, Tex.	Goodling	McEwen
Cederberg	Grasso	McFall
Celler	Gray	McKay
Chamberlain	Green, Oreg.	McKevitt
Chisholm	Green, Pa.	McKinney
Clancy	Griffin	McMillan
Clausen, Don H.	Grover	Macdonald
Clawson, Del	Gubser	Mass.
Cleveland	Gude	Madden
Collier	Hagan	Mahon
Collins, Tex.	Haley	Mailliard
Colmer	Hamilton	Mallory
Conable	Hammer	Mann
Conte	schmidt	Martin
	Hanley	Mathias, Calif.
	Hanna	Mathis, Ga.
	Hansen, Idaho	Matsunaga

Mayne	Railsback	Steele
Mazzoli	Randall	Steiger, Ariz.
Meeds	Rarick	Stephens
Melcher	Rees	Stokes
Miller, Calif.	Reid	Stratton
Mills, Md.	Reuss	Stuckey
Minish	Rhodes	Sullivan
Mink	Riegle	Talcott
Mitchell	Roberts	Taylor
Mizell	Robinson, Va.	Teague, Calif.
Mollohan	Robison, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Monagan	Rodino	Terry
Montgomery	Roe	Thompson, Ga.
Moorhead	Rogers	Thompson, N.J.
Morgan	Roncallo	Thomson, Wis.
Morse	Rooney, N.Y.	Thone
Mosher	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
Moss	Rosenthal	Udall
Murphy, Ill.	Roush	Ullman
Myers	Rousselot	Van Deerlin
Natcher	Roy	Vander Jagt
Nedzi	Roybal	Vanik
Nichols	Runnels	Veysey
Nix	Ruppe	Vigorito
Obeys	Ruth	Waggonner
O'Hara	Ryan	Waldie
O'Konski	St Germain	Wampler
O'Neill	Sandman	Ware
Passman	Sarbanes	Whalen
Patman	Satterfield	Whalley
Patten	Scherle	White
Pelly	Schneebell	Whitehurst
Pepper	Schwengel	Whitten
Perkins	Scott	Widnall
Pettis	Sebellius	Wiggins
Peyser	Seiberling	Williams
Pickle	Shipley	Wilson, Bob
Pike	Shriver	Wilson, Charles H.
Pirnie	Sikes	Winn
Poage	Sisk	Wolf
Podell	Skubitz	Wright
Poff	Slack	Wyatt
Powell	Smith, Calif.	Wylder
Preyer, N.C.	Smith, Iowa	Wyle
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Wyman
Price, Tex.	Snyder	Young, Fla.
Pucinski	Spence	Young, Tex.
Purcell	Springer	Zablocki
Quie	Stanton	Zion
Quillen	J. William	Zwack
	Steed	

NAYS—9

Findley	Kyl	Miller, Ohio
Gross	Landgrebe	Schmitz
Hall	Latta	Steiger, Wis.

NOT VOTING—59

Abbott	Dow	Landrum
Alexander	Dowdy	Metcalfe
Anderson, Ill.	Dulski	Mikva
Ashbrook	Dwyer	Mills, Ark.
Aspinall	Edwards, La.	Minshall
Baring	Eshleman	Murphy, N.Y.
Belcher	Fulton	Nelsen
Bow	Fuqua	Pryor, Ark.
Camp	Galifianakis	Rangel
Chappell	Gaydos	Rostenkowski
Clark	Griffiths	Saylor
Clay	Halpern	Scheuer
Collins, Ill.	Hastings	Shoup
Conyers	Hays	Staggers
Curlin	Hull	Stanton
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Pa.	James V.
Davis, Wis.	Kemp	Stubblefield
de la Garza	Kluczynski	Symington
Delaney	Kuykendall	Yates
Dent	Kyros	Yatron

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Fulton with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Metcalfe.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Hull.
 Mr. Inouye with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Kemp.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Symington with Mrs. Griffiths.
 Mr. Rangel with Mr. Galifianakis.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
 Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Abbit.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Belcher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 13955) just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1972:

H.R. 10834. An Act authorizing the State of Alaska to operate a passenger vessel of foreign registry between ports in Alaska, and between ports in Alaska and ports in the State of Washington, for a limited period of time; and

H.J. Res. 1097. Joint Resolution making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

OLDER AMERICANS—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-268)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When I addressed the White House Conference on Aging last December, I pledged that I would do all I could to make 1972 a year of action on behalf of older Americans. This message to the Congress represents an important step in fulfilling that promise.

Many of the actions which are outlined in this message have grown out of concerns expressed at the White House Conference and at related meetings across the country. The message also discusses a number of steps that have already been taken or that were announced at an earlier date. All of these actions are part of our comprehensive strategy for helping older Americans.

The momentum which has been generated by all these steps—old and new—will move us toward the great national objectives which the White House Conference set forth. I pledge that this

momentum will be sustained as we follow through on these initiatives and as we keep other recommendations of the White House Conference at the top of our agenda, under continuing review.

This message, then, does not represent the last word I will have to say on this important subject. It does, however, identify those administrative steps which we are taking immediately to help older Americans, along with a number of legislative initiatives which should be of highest priority on this year's congressional agenda.

We often hear these days about the "impatience of youth." But if we stop to think about the matter, it is the elderly who have the best reason to be impatient. As so many older Americans have candidly told me, "We simply do not have time to wait while the Government procrastinates. For us, the future is now." I believe this same sense of urgency should characterize the Government's response to the concerns of the elderly. I hope and trust that the Congress will join me in moving forward in that spirit.

A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR MEETING COMPLEX PROBLEMS

The role of older people in American life has changed dramatically in recent decades. For one thing, the number of Americans 65 and over is more than six times as great today as it was in 1900—compared to less than a 3-fold increase in the population under 65. In 1900, one out of every 25 Americans was 65 or over; today one in 10 has reached his 65th birthday.

While the number of older Americans has been growing so rapidly, their traditional pattern of living has been severely disrupted. In an earlier era, the typical American family was multigenerational—grandparents and even great-grandparents lived in the same household with their children and grandchildren, or at least lived nearby. In recent years, however, the ties of family and of place have been loosened—with the result that more and more of our older citizens must live apart or alone. The rapid increase in mandatory retirement provisions has compounded this trend toward isolation. Under such conditions, other problems of older persons such as ill health and low income have become even more burdensome. And all of these difficulties are intensified, of course, for members of minority groups and for those who are blind or deaf or otherwise handicapped.

The sense of separation which has characterized the lives of many older Americans represents a great tragedy for our country. In the first place, it denies many older citizens the sense of fulfillment and satisfaction they deserve for the contributions they have made throughout their lifetime. Secondly, it denies the country the full value of the skills and insights and moral force which the older generation is uniquely capable of offering.

The major challenge which confronts us, then, as we address the problems of older Americans is the new generation gap which has emerged in this country in recent decades between those who are over 65 and those who are younger. The way to bridge this gap, in my judgment,

is to stop treating older Americans as a burden and to start treating them as a resource. We must fight the many forces which can cause older persons to feel dependent or isolated and provide instead continuing opportunities for them to be self-reliant and involved.

If we can accomplish this goal, our entire Nation will reap immense benefits. As I put it in my speech to the White House Conference on Aging, " * * * any action which enhances the dignity of older Americans enhances the dignity of all Americans, for unless the American dream comes true for our older generation, it cannot be complete for any generation."

From its very beginnings, this Administration has worked diligently to achieve this central objective. To assist me in this effort, I established a special task force on aging in 1969. In that same year, I elevated the Commissioner on Aging, John Martin, to the position of Special Assistant to the President on Aging, the first such position in history. Later, I created a new Cabinet-level Committee on Aging, under the leadership of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to ensure that the concerns of the aging were regularly and thoroughly considered by this Administration and that our policies to help older persons were effectively carried out. To provide greater opportunity for older Americans to express their own concerns and to recommend new policies, I convened the White House Conference on Aging—which met last December and which was preceded and followed by many other meetings at the grassroots level. I asked the Cabinet-level Committee on Aging to place the recommendations of the Conference at the top of its agenda. And I also asked the Chairman of the Conference, Arthur Flemming, to stay on as the first Special Consultant to the President on Aging, so that the voice of older Americans would continue to be heard at the very highest levels of the Government.

One dimension of our efforts over the last three years is evident when we look at the Federal budget. If our budget proposals are accepted, overall Federal spending for the elderly in fiscal year 1973 will be \$50 billion, nearly 150 percent of what it was when this Administration took office. One particularly important example of increased concern for the elderly is the fact that overall Federal spending under the Older Americans Act alone has grown from \$32 million in fiscal year 1969 to a proposed \$257 million in fiscal year 1973—an eight-fold increase. This figure includes the \$157 million I originally requested in my 1973 budget, plus an additional \$100 million which I am requesting in this message for nutrition and related services.

How much money we spend on aging programs is only one part of the story, however. How we spend it is an equally important question. It is my conviction that the complex, interwoven problems of older Americans demand, above all else, a comprehensive response, one which attacks on a variety of fronts and meets a variety of problems.

This message outlines the comprehensive strategy which this Administration had developed for bridging the new generation gap and enhancing the dignity and independence of older Americans. That strategy has five major elements:

1. Protecting the income position of the elderly;
2. Upgrading the quality of nursing home care;
3. Helping older persons live dignified, independent lives in their own homes or residences—by expanding and reforming service programs;
4. Expanding opportunities for older people to continue their involvement in the life of the country; and
5. Reorganizing the Federal Government to better meet the changing needs of older Americans.

A SUMMARY OF MAJOR INITIATIVES

In addition to discussing important actions which have been taken in the past or are now underway, this message focuses attention on the following major items of new and pending business.

1. To protect the income position of older Americans, The Congress should:

- enact H.R. 1 as soon as possible, thus providing older Americans with \$5½ billion of additional annual income. H.R. 1 would increase social security benefits by 5 percent, make social security inflation-proof, increase widow, widower and delayed retirement benefits, liberalize earnings tests, and establish a floor under the income of older Americans for the first time;
- repeal the requirement that participants in part B of Medicare must pay a monthly premium which is scheduled to reach \$5.80 this July. This step would make available to older persons an additional \$1.5 billion—the equivalent of roughly another 4 percent increase in social security benefits for persons 65 and over;
- strengthen the role played by private pension plans by providing tax deductions to encourage their expansion, requiring the vesting of pensions, and protecting the investments which have been made in these funds;
- enact revenue sharing proposals designed to provide the opportunity for significant property tax relief; and
- enact my proposed consumer protection legislation which deals with problems which are especially acute for older citizens.

The Administration will:

- continue its investigation of alternative methods for financing public education in such a manner as to relieve the present heavy reliance on property taxes;
- propose major improvements in the military retirement system, including a one-time recomputation of retired pay;
- continue the battle against price inflation, with special emphasis in the health care field;
- develop a program to foster greater awareness among older citizens of their legal rights under the Inter-

state Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; and

- develop a program designed to help each State create consumer education programs for older citizens.

2. *To upgrade the quality of nursing home care,*

The Congress should:

- make it possible for the Federal Government to assume the entire cost of State inspection of homes receiving payments under the Medicaid program; and
- approve my request for additional funds for training nursing home personnel.

The Administration will:

- continue to strengthen and expedite other portions of my 8-point program for upgrading nursing homes, including my commitment to withdraw Federal funds from those homes that refuse to meet standards and to make adequate alternative arrangements for those who are displaced from substandard homes; and
- develop proposals for protecting older persons in the purchase of nursing home services.

3. *To help older persons live dignified, independent lives in their own homes or residences,*

The Congress should:

- appropriate the \$100 million I requested for the Administration on Aging in my 1973 budget;
- appropriate an additional \$100 million for nutritional and related purposes;
- appropriate \$57 million for other programs under the Older Americans Act, bringing total spending under this act to \$257 million—an eight-fold increase over fiscal year 1969;
- renew and strengthen the Older Americans Act, which so many older persons rightly regard as landmark legislation in the field of aging—extending it for an indefinite period rather than for a specified period of years;
- create a new, coordinated system for service delivery under this act, so that the Administration on Aging can help develop goals for such services, while State and area agencies create specific plans for achieving these goals; and
- allow States and localities to use some of the funds now in the Highway Trust Fund to finance their mass transit programs, including special programs to help the elderly.

The Administration will:

- ensure that Departments and agencies involved in the field of aging identify the portion of their total resources that are available for older persons and ensure that use of these resources is effectively coordinated all across the Government;
- strengthen the role already played by local officials of the Social Security Administration and other agencies in providing information about Federal services to older persons and in receiving their complaints;

- launch this summer a new Project FIND—a program which will enlist the services of Government workers at the grassroots level in an outreach effort to locate older persons who are not involved in Federal nutrition programs and who should be;
- step up efforts to meet the special transportation needs of older Americans, giving priority to community requests for capital grants that aid the elderly from the Urban Mass Transportation Fund;

- provide more and better housing for older Americans by issuing new guidelines for two HUD programs to make them more readily applicable to the elderly, by extending the mortgage maturity for the FHA-insured nursing home program, by drawing upon research of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to reduce crime, by encouraging the provisions of more space for senior centers within housing projects for the elderly, and by developing training programs in the management of housing for older persons.

4. *To expand opportunities for older persons to continue their involvement in the life of our country,*

The Congress should:

- appropriate the funds I have requested for such action programs as Retired Senior Volunteers and Foster Grandparents;
- authorize the ACTION agency to expand person-to-person volunteer service programs, helping more older Americans to work both with children and with older persons who need their help; and
- broaden the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to include State and local governments.

The Administration will:

- work with 130 national voluntary groups across the country in a special program to stimulate volunteer action; and
- develop a national program to expand employment opportunities for persons over 65, through programs such as Senior Aides and Green Thumb, by urging State and local governments to make job opportunities available under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, by working through the public employment offices to open part-time job opportunities in both the public and private sector, and by reaffirming Federal policy against age discrimination in appointment to Federal jobs.

5. *To improve Federal organization for future efforts,*

The Administration will:

- strengthen the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's Advisory Committee on Older Americans—providing it with permanent staff capability to support its increased responsibilities;
- arrange for the Commissioner of Aging, in his capacity as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Aging, to report directly to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

- create a Technical Advisory Committee on Aging Research in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a comprehensive plan for economic, social, psychological, health and education research on aging.

PROTECTING THE INCOME POSITION OF OLDER AMERICANS

Perhaps the most striking change in the lives of most Americans when they turn 65 is the sudden loss of earned income which comes with retirement. The most important thing we can do to enhance the independence and self-reliance of older Americans is to help them protect their income position. I have long been convinced that the best way to help people in need is not by having Government provide them with a vast array of bureaucratic services but by giving them money so that they can secure needed services for themselves. This understanding is fundamental to my approach to the problems of the aging.

The success of this income-oriented strategy depends in turn on giving effective attention to two factors: first, where older Americans' money comes from and second, what it is used for.

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM: REFORMING AND EXPANDING GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The most important income source for most older Americans is social security. Accordingly, improvements in social security have been the center piece of this Administration's efforts to assist the elderly. Today, approximately 85 percent of all Americans over 65 receive regular cash benefits from social security, while 93 percent of those now reaching age 65 are eligible to receive such benefits when they or their spouses retire.

Since 1969, social security cash benefits have been increased twice—a fifteen percent increase in January of 1970 and another ten percent increase one year later. These increases represent a \$10 billion annual increase in cash income for social security beneficiaries. As I suggested, however, in my 1969 message to the Congress concerning social security reform, bringing benefit payments up to date alone is not enough. We must also make sure that benefit payments stay up to date and that all recipients are treated fairly.

My specific proposals for achieving these ends are presently contained in the bill known as H.R. 1—legislation which is of overwhelming importance for older Americans. This bill passed the House of Representatives in the first session of the 92d Congress and is presently pending before the Senate Finance Committee. I continue to believe firmly that H.R. 1 is the single most significant piece of social legislation to come before the Congress in many decades.

Let us consider the several ways in which this legislation would help the elderly:

1. *An Additional Increase in Social Security.* Under H.R. 1, social security benefits would be increased by an additional 5 percent effective in June of 1972. This increase would provide \$2.1 billion in additional income for older Americans during the first full year that it is effective. It would mean that social

security benefits would be one-third higher after this June than they were just 2½ years ago. *This represents the most rapid rate of increase in the history of the social security program.*

2. *Making Social Security "Inflation Proof."* Under H.R. 1, social security payments would, for the first time, be automatically protected against inflation. Whenever the Consumer Price Index increased by 3 percent or more, benefits would be increased by an equal amount. Payments that keep pace with the cost of living would thus become a guaranteed right for older Americans—and not something for which they have to battle again and again, year after year.

3. *Increased Widow's Benefits.* About 58 percent of the population age 65 and over are women, most of whom depend primarily on social security benefits earned by their husbands. Under the present law, however, widows are eligible for only 82½ percent of the retirement benefits which would be paid to their late husbands if they were still alive. H.R. 1 would correct this situation by increasing widows' benefits to 100 percent of the benefits payable to their late husbands. It would similarly expand the eligibility of a widower for benefits payable to his late wife. Altogether, this provision would mean that about 3.4 million widows and widowers would receive increased benefits totaling almost three quarters of a billion dollars in the first full year.

4. *Increased Benefits for Delayed Retirement.* Under present law, those who choose not to retire at age 65 forfeit their social security benefits for the period between the time they are 65 and the time they finally retire. H.R. 1 would allow retirees to make up a portion of these lost benefits through higher payments after retirement. Benefits would increase by one percent for each year that a person had worked between the ages of 65 and 72.

5. *Liberalized Earnings Tests.* Like the increased benefit for delayed retirement, the liberalized earnings tests contained in H.R. 1 would encourage more of our older citizens to remain active in the economic life of our country. This is a step which I promised to take in the 1968 campaign and for which I have been working ever since.

It is high time this step was taken. Those who can work and want to work should not be discouraged from working—as they often are under the present law. By reducing the barriers to work, we can increase the sense of participation among older citizens and at the same time tap their energies and experience more effectively.

Under H.R. 1, the amount that a beneficiary could earn without losing any social security would be increased from \$1,680 a year to \$2,000 a year. That ceiling, in turn, would be automatically increased each time there was a cost of living benefit increase in social security. In addition, for those who earn in excess of \$2,000, the potential reduction in social security payments would also be lessened. Under the present law, benefits are reduced by \$1 for each \$2 of extra earnings, but this rate applies only to the first \$1,200 earned above the exempt amount.

Additional earnings beyond that level now cause benefits to be reduced on a \$1 for \$1 basis. Under H.R. 1, benefits would be reduced on a \$1 for \$2 basis for all earnings above \$2,000—no matter how much more a person earned.

6. *Adult Assistance Reform.* One of the most important elements of H.R. 1—and one of the most under-publicized—is its provision to place a national floor under the income of every older American. H.R. 1 would replace the present Old Age Assistance program with a single, federally-financed program which would provide a monthly income of \$150 for an individual and \$200 for a couple when fully effective.

This program would assist 4.5 million elderly persons instead of the 2.1 million currently reached. It would also eliminate the practice of placing liens on homes as a condition of eligibility. Eligibility for assistance would be determined on the basis of need without regard to the income or assets of relatives. Relative-responsibility rules would not be a part of this new program.

I believe this reform is particularly important since it channels massive resources—some \$2.8 billion in additional annual benefits—to those whose needs are greatest.

7. *Special Minimum Benefits.* H.R. 1 would also provide special minimum benefits for people who have worked for 15 years or more under social security. The guaranteed minimum benefit would range from \$75 a month for a person who had worked 15 years under social security to \$150 a month for a person with 30 years of such work experience. At maturity, this provision would increase overall benefit payments to \$600 million.

H.R. 1: THE NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

In addition to all of these benefits for older people, H.R. 1 would have enormous benefits for many younger Americans as well. Clearly the passage of this bill is a matter of the very highest priority. I have made that statement repeatedly since I first proposed this far-reaching program in 1969. As I make that statement again today, I do so with the conviction that further delay is absolutely inexcusable. To delay these reforms by even one more year would mean a loss for older Americans alone of more than \$5 billion.

It is my profound hope that the Senate will now carry forward the momentum which has been generated by the passage of H.R. 1 in the House of Representatives, thus seizing an historic opportunity—and meeting an historic obligation.

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM: MILITARY, VETERANS AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

We are also making significant progress toward improving the retirement income of career military personnel, veterans and Federal employees.

1. *To improve military benefits,* I will soon submit legislation to the Congress for recomputing retirement pay on the basis of January 1, 1971 pay scales, thus liberalizing annuities for current retirees. I will also submit legislation to provide—for the first time—full annuities for retired reservists at an earlier age, and to revise benefit payments so that re-

tirees receive their full annuities when they are most needed, at the conventional age of full retirement. I hope these proposals will receive favorable consideration.

In addition, I support legislation to provide military retirees with a less expensive survivor annuity plan—one which is similar to that now provided to retired civil servants.

2. *Benefits for veterans* are also improving. Our efforts to improve both the quality of care and the number of patients treated in Veterans Administration hospitals will have a major impact on older veterans, since more than one-fourth of all VA patients are over 65. The staff to patient ratio at VA hospitals will be increased to 1.5 to 1, an all-time high, if our budget proposals are accepted.

The fiscal year 1973 budget also provides for further increases in nursing home care with the result that the authorized number of VA-operated nursing beds will have doubled since 1969 and the number of community contract beds and State home beds built and operated with VA subsidies will have increased by one-third over the same period.

In addition, I have signed into law significant improvements in pensions for elderly veterans which relate benefits more closely to need and protect recipients from income loss because of increases in the cost of living. In January of 1971, pensions were increased by an average of 9.6 percent. One year later, they went up an additional 6.5 percent and a new formula was adopted relating benefits more closely to need for the first time.

3. *Federal Employee Benefits* are also up. Retirement benefits for Federal employees have been liberalized in several instances, and—under a more generous formula for determining cost of living increases—annuities have gone up nearly 16 percent in the last 2½ years. In addition, the Government's contribution to Federal health benefit premiums of current and retired employees has been substantially increased.

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM: REFORMING THE PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEM

Only 21 percent of couples now on our social security rolls and only 8 percent of non-married beneficiaries are also receiving private pensions. While this picture will improve somewhat as workers who are now younger reach retirement, nevertheless—despite the best efforts of labor and management—only half the work force is presently covered by private pension plans. As the White House Conference on Aging pointed out, the long-range answer to adequate income for the elderly does not lie in Government programs alone; it also requires expansion and reform of our private pension system.

Late last year, I submitted to the Congress a five-point program to achieve this goal. It includes the following items:

1. *Tax deductions to encourage independent savings toward retirement.* Individual contributions to group or individual pension plans should be made tax deductible up to the level of \$1,500 per year or 20 percent of earned income,

whichever is less. Individuals should also be able to defer taxation of investment earnings on these contributions.

2. *More generous tax deductions for pension contributions by self-employed persons.* The annual limit for deductible contributions to pension plans by the self-employed—on their own behalf and for those who work for them—should be raised from \$2,500 or 10 percent of earned income, whichever is less, to the lesser of \$7,500 or 15 percent of earned income.

3. *Requiring the vesting of pensions.* Persons who have worked for an employer for a significant period should be able to retain their pension rights even if they leave or lose their jobs before retirement. Unfortunately, many workers do not now have this assurance—their pensions are not vested. To change this situation, I have proposed a new law under which all pensions would become vested as an employee's age and seniority increased. Under this law, the share of participants in private pension plans with vested pensions would rise from 31 percent to 47 percent and the overall number of employees with vested rights would increase by 3.6 million. Most importantly, among participants age 45 and older, the percentage with vested pensions would rise from 60 percent to 92 percent.

4. *The Employee Benefits Protection Act.* This legislation was first proposed to the Congress in March of 1970; it was strengthened and resubmitted in 1971. It would require that pension funds be administered under strict fiduciary standards and would provide certain Federal remedies when they are not. It would also require that plans provide full information to employees and beneficiaries concerning their rights and benefits.

5. *A study of pension plan terminations.* In my December message, I also directed the Departments of Labor and the Treasury to undertake a one-year study concerning the extent of benefit losses which result from the termination of private pension plans. This study will provide the information we need in order to make solid recommendations in this field, providing needed protection without reducing benefits because of increased costs.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES: THE BURDEN OF HEALTH COSTS

Growing old often means both declining income and declining health. And declining health, in turn, means rising expenditures for health care. Per capita health expenditures in fiscal year 1971 were \$861 for persons 65 and older, but only \$250 for persons under 65. In short, older Americans often find that they must pay their *highest* medical bills at the very time in their lives when they are *least* able to afford them.

Medicare, of course, is now providing significant assistance in meeting this problem for most older Americans. In fiscal year 1971, this program accounted for 62 percent of their expenditures for hospital and physicians' services and 42 percent of their total health payments. In addition, an estimated 40 percent of Medicaid expenditures go to support the health costs of the elderly, while other programs provide significant additional assistance.

But serious problems still remain. Accordingly, this Administration has been working in a number of ways to provide even more help for the elderly in the health-care field. One of our most important proposals is now pending before the Congress. I refer to the recommendation I made more than a year ago that the Congress combine part B of Medicare—the supplementary medical insurance program, with part A—the hospital insurance program, thus eliminating the special monthly premium which older persons must pay to participate in part B—a premium which will reach \$5.80 per month by July. I have reaffirmed my commitment to this important initiative on other occasions and today I affirm it once again. Elimination of the premium payment alone would augment the annual income of the elderly by approximately \$1.5 billion, the equivalent, on the average, of almost a 4 percent increase in social security for persons 65 and over. I hope the Congress will delay no longer in approving this important proposal.

Our concern with health costs for older Americans provides additional reasons for the prompt approval of H.R. 1. Under that bill:

- Provision is made for extending Medicare to many of the disabled (about 69 percent of whom are age 55 and over) who are drawing social security benefits and who have had to give up work before reaching regular retirement age;

- Medicare beneficiaries would have the opportunity to enroll in Health Maintenance organizations—organizations which I strongly endorsed in my special message on health policy because of my conviction that they help to prevent serious illness and also help to make the delivery of health care more efficient;

- Provision is made for removing the uncertainties relative to coverage under Medicare when a person needs to use extended care facilities after hospitalization.

In my recent message to Congress on health policy, I indicated a number of other measures which will help reduce the cost of health care. I spoke, for example, of the special attention we have been giving under Phase II of our New Economic Policy to the problem of skyrocketing health costs, through the special Health Services Industry Committee of the Cost of Living Council. I indicated that a number of cost control features would be introduced into the Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement processes—with the overall effect of reducing health costs. I have also called for new research efforts in fields such as heart disease, cancer, and accident prevention—initiatives which also promise to reduce health problems—and health bills—for older persons.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES: INFLATION

Inadequate retirement incomes are strained even further when inflation forces older persons to stretch them to meet rising costs. Because older persons are uniquely dependent on relatively fixed incomes, they are uniquely victimized by the ravages of inflation. While

my proposals for making social security benefits inflation-proof will provide significant help in defending the elderly against this menace, it is also important that we take on this enemy directly—that we curb inflationary pressures.

This goal has been a central one of this Administration. When I came to office this country was suffering from a massive wave of price inflation—one which had resulted in large measure from the methods chosen to finance the Vietnam War. The problem of reversing this wave by conventional methods was a more stubborn problem, frankly, than I expected it to be when I took office. By the summer of 1971, it became clear that additional tools were needed if inflation was to be quickly and responsibly controlled. Accordingly, I announced last August a New Economic Policy—one which has received the strong support of the Congress and the American people.

I have been especially gratified that older Americans—whose stake in the battle against inflation is so high—have rallied to support this new economic program. With their continued support—and that of all the American people—we can carry this battle forward and win a decisive victory.

One key element in that battle, of course, is to be sure that Government spending programs, including those which help the elderly, are responsibly financed. If they are not, then inflation will merely be reignited and Government policy will merely be robbing older Americans with one hand of the aid it gives them with the other.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES: PROPERTY TAXES

Two-thirds of all older citizens—and 78 percent of older married couples—own their own homes. For these Americans—and for many younger Americans as well—the heavy and growing burden of property taxes constitutes one of the most serious of all income-related problems. Even those who rent their homes often bear an unfair burden since property tax increases are frequently passed along in the form of higher rents. The reason these burdens are so onerous, of course, is that the income from which property taxes must be paid by the elderly is usually going *down* at the very time the taxes are going *up*.

Property taxes in the United States have more than doubled in the last 10 years. The problems which this fact implies are felt by Americans of all ages. But elderly Americans have a special stake in their solution.

I am committed to doing all I can to relieve the crushing burden of property taxes. I have been proceeding toward this end in two ways. First, I am continuing to push for passage of our general and special revenue-sharing proposals, legislation which would channel some \$17 billion into State and local budgets and thus provide a significant opportunity for property tax relief. At the same time, as I indicated in my recent State of the Union Address, I am also moving to change the system through which we finance public education. In developing a new approach, I will draw on the recommendations of the President's Commis-

sion on School Finance, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and other analyses such as those which are being performed under the direction of the Secretaries of the Treasury, and of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose of this intensive investigation is to develop ways of putting this Nation's educational system on a sounder financial footing while helping to relieve the enormous burden of school property taxes.

REDUCING INCOME TAX BURDENS

Recently approved and pending changes in the income tax laws also provide special help to older persons. Under these provisions, a single person age 65 or over would be able to receive up to \$5,100 of income without paying any Federal income taxes, while a married couple with both husband and wife 65 or over would be able to receive up to \$8,000 of such tax-free income.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES: PROTECTING ELDERLY CONSUMERS

The quality of life for older Americans depends to a large extent upon the responsiveness of the marketplace to their special needs. It is estimated that elderly persons now spend over \$60 billion for goods and services every year—and they will be able to spend billions more if my proposals for increasing their income are enacted. Our economy should be responsive to the needs of older Americans; they have a high stake in advancing consumer protection.

Through organizational changes, administrative actions and legislative recommendations, this Administration has been working to provide needed protection for the American consumer in general—and for the older consumer in particular. The several pieces of consumer legislation which I have submitted to the Congress are designed to reduce dangers which are especially acute for older consumers—and I again urge their enactment.

In addition, I am asking my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, in cooperation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to develop a program for helping to enforce the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act by fostering greater awareness among older citizens of their legal rights under this legislation.

Recognizing that the complexity of today's marketplace demands great sophistication by the individual consumer, our primary and secondary schools have stepped up their programs for consumer education. Unfortunately, many older Americans have never had the opportunity to benefit from such programs. The Office of Consumer Affairs is therefore developing guidelines for adult consumer education programs with particular emphasis on the needs of the elderly. To carry out these guidelines, I am asking my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, working in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to develop a program of technical assistance to help the States create consumer education programs specifically designed for older citizens.

A COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT FOR IMPROVING INCOME

The key characteristic of my strategy for protecting the income position of older Americans is its *comprehensiveness*. For it would help to augment and protect the income older persons derive from social security, adult assistance, Federal military, veterans and civilian benefits, and private pensions, while at the same time curbing the cruel drain on those incomes from rising health costs, inflation, taxes and unwise consumer spending. I hope now that the Congress will respond promptly and favorably to these proposals. If it does, then the purchasing power of the elderly can be enhanced by billions of dollars a year—an achievement which could do more than anything else to transform the quality of life for Americans over 65.

UPGRADING THE QUALITY OF NURSING HOME CARE

Income related measures can help more older Americans to help themselves; they build on the strong desire for independence and self-reliance which characterizes the older generation. We must recognize, however, that some older Americans—approximately five percent by recent estimates—cannot be primarily self-reliant. These older men and women require the assistance provided by skilled nursing homes and other long-term care facilities. For them, a dignified existence depends upon the care and concern which are afforded them in such settings.

In June of 1971, at a regional convention of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons, I pledged to meet the challenge of upgrading nursing home care in America. I expressed my determination that nursing homes, for those who need them, should be shining symbols of comfort and concern. I noted that many such facilities provide high quality care, but that many others fall woefully short of this standard. I observed that those who must live in such facilities are virtual prisoners in an atmosphere of neglect and degradation.

Following that speech, I directed the development of an action plan to improve nursing home care and I announced that 8-point plan in August of 1971. I am pleased to be able to report that we have made significant progress in carrying out that plan. We have delivered on all of the eight promises implied in that program. Let us look at each of them:

1. *Training State Nursing Home Inspectors*—Through February of 1972, almost 450 surveyors had been trained in federally-sponsored programs at three universities. Contract negotiations are underway to continue ongoing programs and to establish new ones at two university training centers.

2. *Complete Federal Support of State Inspections Under Medicaid*—Legislation to raise the level of financial participation by the Federal Government in this activity to 100 percent was submitted to the Congress on October 7, 1971, as an amendment to H.R. 1. This proposal is awaiting Congressional action.

3. *Consolidation of Enforcement Activities*—A new Office of Nursing Home Affairs has been established in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This unit is directly responsible for coordinating all efforts to meet our July 1, 1972, deadline for inspections of skilled nursing homes and for certification of these facilities in accordance with proper procedures.

4. *Strengthening Federal Enforcement*—142 new positions have been allocated to the Medical Services Administration to enforce Medicaid standards and regulations. Added emphasis is being placed on the audit process as a tool for enforcement; 34 additional positions are being added in HEW's Audit Agency to perform audits of nursing home operations.

5. *Short-term Training for Professional and Paraprofessional Nursing Home Personnel*—This program is currently funded at the \$2.4 million level and is scheduled to train 20,000 persons. The fiscal year 1973 budget which I submitted to the Congress contains \$3 million to train an additional 21,000 persons.

6. *Assistance for State Investigative Units*—A program to develop and test investigative-ombudsman units to respond to individual complaints and to other problems in the nursing home area has also been initiated. As an interim mechanism, nearly 900 social security district and branch offices have been designated as listening posts to receive and investigate complaints and suggestions about nursing home conditions.

7. *Comprehensive Review of Long-term Care*—The Office of Nursing Home Affairs is now carrying out a comprehensive analysis of issues related to long-term care.

8. *Cracking Down on Substandard Nursing Homes*—Progress is also being made on this important front. Last December I signed legislation which, among other things, authorizes Federal quality standards for intermediate care facilities, thus giving us additional authority to guarantee a decent environment for those who live in long-term care facilities.

Every State providing nursing home care under the Medicare and Medicaid programs has now installed systems for surveying and certifying nursing homes. In the area of fire-safety and other safety guidelines, a coordinated set of standards for home providing care under these programs is being put into effect.

Medicaid compliance activities have also been stepped up. Onsite Federal reviews of State Medicaid certification procedures have been carried out. Deficiencies in those procedures were found in 39 States. These deficiencies were publicly announced by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on November 30, 1971, along with a timetable for correcting them. Since that time, 38 of the 39 States have made the necessary corrections. We have determined that every facility receiving Medicaid funds must have been inspected and correctly certified by July 1, 1972.

While we prefer to upgrade substandard homes rather than shut them down,

we will not hesitate to cut off money when that is necessary. As of February 11, 1972, in fact, 13 extended care facilities had been decertified for participation in Medicare. In such cases, as I have often pledged before, we are firmly committed to seeing that adequate alternative arrangements are made for those who are displaced.

In fiscal year 1971, the Federal Government contributed \$1.2 billion to the cost of nursing home care. We should also remember, however, that more than 40 percent of the annual expenditure for nursing homes is borne by private sources. In addition to seeing that Federal tax dollars are properly spent in this area, it is also important that private individuals are protected when they purchase nursing home services. I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop proposals to deal with this dimension of the nursing home challenge.

SPECIAL SERVICES TO FOSTER INDEPENDENCE

Improving the income position of older Americans and upgrading nursing homes—these are two concerns which have been of highest priority for this Administration in the past and which will continue to be central in the future. As we work to develop a truly comprehensive strategy, however, other agenda items have also been emerging as areas of special emphasis, particularly those involving public and private services which can help older persons live dignified, independent lives in their own homes for as long as possible.

INCREASED RESOURCES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Since the passage of the Older Americans Act in 1965, the Administration on Aging has had the lead Federal role in developing and coordinating such services. While that office has accomplished many significant things, the importance and urgency of its mission have outstripped its financial resources.

It was to help remedy this situation that I announced at the White House Conference on Aging last December that I would call for a five-fold increase in the budget of the Administration on Aging—from \$21 million to \$100 million. As I will discuss below in greater detail, I am now requesting an additional \$100 million for nutritional and related purposes, money which would also be spent through the Administration on Aging.

With this substantial increase in funds, we would be able to step up significantly our efforts to develop and coordinate a wide range of social and nutritional services for older Americans. Our central aim in all of these activities will be to prevent unnecessary institutionalization—and to lessen the isolation of the elderly wherever possible.

EXTENDING THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Since its passage in 1965, the Older Americans Act has served as an important charter for Federal service programs for the elderly. Unless the act is promptly extended, however, the grant programs it authorizes will expire on June 30th. This must not happen. I therefore urge that this landmark legislation be extended—and that the exten-

sion be indefinite, rather than limited to a specific period of time.

STRENGTHENING THE PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF SERVICES

In addition, I am asking that the Older Americans Act be amended to strengthen our planning and delivery systems for services to the elderly. Too often in the past, these "systems" have really been "non-systems," badly fragmented, poorly planned and insufficiently coordinated. My proposed amendments are designed to remedy these deficiencies.

We should begin by helping to develop and strengthen the planning capacities of the State agencies on aging and of new area agencies on aging which would be established within each State. Up to 75 percent of the administrative costs of these new area planning agencies would be funded by the Administration on Aging, which would also establish general goals to which activities at the State and local levels would be directed. One of the major priorities would be to enhance and maintain the independence of older citizens.

The State and area planning agencies would plan for the mobilization and coordination of a wide range of resources—public and private—to meet such goals. The Administration on Aging would be authorized to fund up to 90 percent of the cost of social and nutritional services provided under plans developed by the area planning agencies. In fiscal year 1973, \$160 million would be allocated in formula grants for nutritional and social services. An additional \$40 million would be allocated in special project assistance to develop new and innovative approaches and to strengthen particularly promising area plans.

By establishing overall objectives and by providing both money and mechanisms for a stronger planning and coordination effort, we can ensure that resources and energies which are now widely scattered and fragmented can be pulled together in ways which will notably increase their impact.

COORDINATING FEDERAL EFFORTS

Even as we strengthen coordination at grassroots levels, so we must do a better job of coordinating Federal programs. As this message makes clear, efforts are being made all across our Government to help older citizens. But if there was one clear message at the White House Conference on Aging, it was that this wide range of Federal resources must be better coordinated. To help achieve this important objective, I have directed my Special Consultant on Aging to work with all these agencies in an intense new effort to develop coordinated services.

As the first step in this effort, I have directed those agencies whose programs have a major impact on the lives of older persons to provide the Cabinet-level Committee on Aging, within sixty days, with the amounts they identify as serving the needs of the elderly. In addition, I am directing that each agency identify, within the total amount it expects to spend for its aging programs, a sum that will be available to the States and localities for purposes related to the Older Americans Act. The Administra-

tion on Aging will then provide this information to the States so that it can be utilized in the State and local planning process. State aging agencies will also be able to transmit their views on proposed Federal programs, thereby furthering the interchange of information and strengthening overall coordination.

Under these procedures, we can ensure that all resources for helping the elderly are fully marshalled and coordinated, in a way which is responsive to the special needs of every State and locality in our land.

ESTABLISHING INFORMATION AND COMPLAINT CENTERS

We must also work to improve communications between the Federal Government and older Americans and to alert the Government to areas of special need. Because older persons often have some difficulty moving about conveniently, and because services are often fragmented and channeled through complex bureaucratic mechanisms, it is especially important that the elderly have one place to turn where they can obtain needed information and let their views be heard.

As I have already noted, we have been moving in this direction under my program to upgrade the quality of nursing home care. Following the directive which I announced at the White House Conference on Aging, social security offices have also been expanding their information and referral services for the elderly. District and branch offices are now handling more than 200,000 such inquiries each month—and that number is expected to increase. A task force is now at work within the Social Security Administration to examine ways of improving this service.

As another step in this direction, I have directed the Cabinet-level Committee on Aging to examine ways in which we can use other Government offices—such as the General Services Administration's Federal Information Centers and the Agricultural Extension Service's local offices—in further expanding and improving our information and complaint services.

FIGHTING HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

In addition to our overall funding and coordination proposals concerning Federal services, we are also moving ahead in a variety of specific service areas. One of the most important is the fight against hunger and malnutrition among the elderly.

The thought that any older citizens—after a lifetime of service to their communities and country—may suffer from hunger or malnutrition is intolerable. Happily, since I submitted my message on hunger and nutrition to the Congress in May of 1969, we have made significant strides toward eliminating this problem among all age groups in America. Our efforts to increase incomes have been central to this endeavor, of course. But our special food assistance programs have also been substantially augmented.

If my budget proposals for fiscal year 1973 are accepted, overall spending for food stamps will have increased nine-fold since 1969. In the coming fiscal year, an estimated 2 million elderly participants in the Food Stamp Program will

receive benefits of \$343.5 million, compared with only \$45.8 million in fiscal year 1969. Virtually every county in the Nation now offers either the Food Stamp or the Food Distribution Program; in early 1969, nearly 500 counties offered neither. In all, 2.5 million older Americans benefit from at least one of these programs.

Food assistance is important to the elderly. They benefit not only from nutritious food but also from the activity of preparing meals and sharing meal-times with others. To maximize these benefits, the Department of Agriculture in January revised its regulations to improve the nutrition program and expand participation.

But more needs to be done. Many older persons who are entitled to food stamps or to surplus commodities are still not receiving them. Why is this the case? In many instances, older Americans do not realize they are eligible for participation. The agencies which provide assistance are often unaware of older persons who need their services. Some older persons choose not to participate—out of pride or out of fear that accepting food assistance may subject them to the arbitrary treatment they associate with the present welfare system. In some cases, older persons want to participate but find that necessary transportation is unavailable.

To overcome the barriers which keep older Americans from full participation in food assistance programs, we are launching this year a major outreach campaign called Project FIND. This campaign will be conducted through a senior citizen awareness network made up of federally operated or funded field offices and outreach workers. It is my hope that Federally-supported personnel will be augmented in this effort by volunteers from State local government offices and from the private sector. For ninety days, all these workers will go out across our country to find those who should be participating in nutrition programs but who are not yet involved.

Last night, I signed into law S. 1163, a new national nutrition program for the elderly. This program will provide prepared meals in a group setting and delivered meals for those who are confined to their homes. I welcome this effort. Because of my strong feeling that this area should be one of priority action, I will submit to the Congress—as I suggested above—an amendment to my 1973 budget to provide an additional \$100 million for nutritional and related services. My proposed amendments to the Older Americans Act would further strengthen this effort by ensuring that the Food Stamp Program is planned as part of a more comprehensive service effort.

Other steps will also be taken in this area. In some areas, for example, space at federally-assisted housing projects will be utilized for feeding older persons. The support of State and local governments of civic and religious organizations and of the food services industry will also be solicited. Maximum use will be made of existing technical resources, including skilled personnel who have worked with the school lunch program and other special programs of the De-

partment of Agriculture. The time has come for marshalling all of our resources in a comprehensive campaign to meet the nutrition needs of older Americans.

PROVIDING BETTER TRANSPORTATION FOR THE ELDERLY

For many older Americans, lack of mobility means poor access to friends and relatives, to government services and to meaningful participation in the community. Unless we meet the challenge of providing better transportation for older persons, our efforts in other fields will not be as effective as they should be. This is why I told the delegates to the White House Conference on Aging that I would, by administrative action, require that Federal grants which provide services for older persons also ensure that the transportation needed to take advantage of these services is available.

In addition, the Department of Transportation is significantly increasing its program for developing new ways to meet the public transportation needs of older persons. The approaches which are being tested include special new transportation services to take elderly citizens from housing projects and other residential areas to hospitals, senior citizen centers, social service agencies, employment opportunities and the like; and demand-responsive services whereby the elderly are picked up at their doorsteps and taken to specific desired destinations.

Once new ways have been developed for meeting the transportation needs of the elderly, we must also make them generally available. One proposal which could help significantly in this effort is the recommendation recently submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Transportation under which some of the funds now in the Highway Trust Fund could be used by States and localities to augment resources in the mass transportation area.

I hope the Congress will give prompt approval to this important plan. The flexibility it provides would allow State and local officials—who know best the transportation needs of the elderly within their own jurisdictions—to give special consideration to meeting those needs. I am asking the Secretary of Transportation to develop specific suggestions for assisting the States and localities in these undertakings.

In addition, the Department of Transportation is ready to give priority attention to community requests for helping older Americans through capital grants from the Urban Mass Transportation Fund and is willing to commit significant resources to this end. I urge the States and localities to move immediately to take advantage of these resources.

MEETING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF OLDER CITIZENS

This Administration has also worked hard to respond to the very special housing needs of older Americans. It is expected, for example, that an all-time record in producing subsidized and insured housing and nursing homes for the elderly will be achieved this year by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In the current fiscal year, nearly 66,000 units of subsidized housing for the elderly will be funded under HUD's housing assistance programs—a figure which should rise to over 82,000 in fiscal year 1973. In addition, accommodations for over 14,000 people, mostly elderly, will be provided this fiscal year under HUD's nursing and intermediate care facility programs—and nearly 18,000 such accommodations will be provided next year. Finally, a large number of elderly citizens will benefit from other housing funded by this year's record number of nearly 600,000 subsidized housing unit reservations. Clearly, we are making substantial progress in this important area.

A number of other administrative steps have also been taken to ensure that this new housing is responsive to the special needs of the elderly. For example, Secretary Romney recently announced new guidelines for the Section 236 subsidized rental program for lower income elderly tenants. These guidelines will help ensure greater variety in building types, including highrise structures, and more flexibility in their locations. As a result of these guidelines, older persons will find such housing arrangements even better suited to their particular needs.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has also issued initial guidelines for the new Section 106 (a) program which will provide technical assistance to non-profit sponsors of low and moderate income housing—including housing which is specially designed for the elderly.

In addition, the Department will extend the mortgage maturity for its Federal Housing Administration insured nursing home program up to a maximum of 40 years. This decision will not only reduce monthly occupancy charges to patients, but it will also enable sponsors of residential housing to "package" residential and nursing home complexes more easily. The proximity of these facilities will permit elderly persons temporarily to vacate their residential units for short term nursing care—and at the same time remain close to family, friends, and the environment to which they are accustomed.

I have also directed the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to work with the Administration on Aging in developing training programs dealing with the management of housing for the elderly.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has undertaken an intensive research effort to determine factors which encourage or inhibit crime in residential settings and to develop total security systems to reduce crime in housing projects. The Department of Housing and Urban Development plans to use the results of this effort in its housing programs. I have also made grant funds available through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for reducing crime in areas housing older persons. Already, in two cities, funds have been granted specifically for this purpose.

Crime is an especially serious problem for older citizens. Through these and

other measures, we will continue our strong effort to meet this challenge.

Two years ago my task force on aging observed that "older persons would make greater use of many of the services society intends them to receive if these services were made more accessible to them. One reason that the number of senior centers has increased so fast is because centers facilitate the packaging, marketing, and delivery of services." The task force also noted that, "although the number of senior centers has rapidly grown in recent years, centers are still too limited in number to reach more than a fraction of the older population." In my judgement, a natural location for a senior center is a housing facility occupied primarily by older persons.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers two housing programs under which such facilities can be made available to older persons living in the project and in the surrounding neighborhood: the Section 236 Program and the Public Housing Program. Both of these programs provide specially designed housing for lower income older persons. The law under which these programs are administered contains language which allows the financing of facilities designed primarily for use by older persons including "cafeteria or dining halls, community rooms, workshops, infirmaries . . . and other essential service facilities."

To increase the supply of well located senior centers, I have instructed the Department of Housing and Urban Development to encourage greater provision of community space for senior centers within subsidized housing projects for the elderly. The Department will consider the community's overall need for these centers in determining the appropriate scale of centers within such housing projects.

On other fronts, the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture is taking steps to meet the housing needs of elderly persons who live in rural areas. Under the Section 502 program, for example, thousands of elderly families have received millions of dollars in loans for home ownership and repair. The Section 515 program, which provides favorable interest loans with repayment periods of up to 50 years to stimulate the development of rental housing in rural areas, has also moved forward. Rental units financed under this program have tripled from 1969 to 1973.

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT

It is important that we give sufficient attention to the things our Nation should be doing for older Americans. But it is just as important that we remember how much older Americans can do for their Nation. For above all else, what our older citizens want from their country is a chance to be a part of it, a chance to be involved, a chance to contribute.

I am determined that they will have that chance. For as I told the White House Conference, "we cannot be at our best if we keep our most experienced players on the bench." This Administration is deeply committed to involving

older citizens as actively as possible in the life of our Nation—by enhancing their opportunities both for voluntary service and for regular employment.

IMPROVING VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAMS

Voluntary social action has long been recognized as one of the great distinguishing characteristics of America, a force which has helped to unite and focus our diverse people in the pursuit of common goals. And even as the voluntary spirit has helped our country move forward more effectively, it has also provided those who have volunteered for service with a greater sense of fulfillment.

The voluntary spirit is particularly relevant to the lives of older Americans. The White House Conference on Aging, for example, called attention to "ways in which older Americans could fulfill themselves by giving service to one another and to their communities." Delegates to the Conference called for "a national policy . . . to encourage older adults to volunteer," and urged "that existing national older adult voluntary programs should be expanded and funded at adequate levels in order to serve extensive numbers of volunteers." They urged a mobilization of public and private organizations to strengthen the volunteer movement.

I agree completely with these judgments. That is why, at the time of the White House Conference, I pledged to move successful voluntary programs from demonstration status to full operation on the national level, an expansion effort that is rapidly moving forward.

I requested, for example, that the Foster Grandparent program be doubled to \$25 million, providing for 11,500 foster grandparents to serve 23,000 children each day—50,000 children in all each year—in some 450 child care institutions throughout the country. I also asked that ACTION's Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) be tripled to \$15 million so that as many as 75,000 senior volunteers could be involved in community services.

When the RSVP program has developed to the full extent permitted by the new appropriations, as many as 11,000 volunteers will be serving older persons in nursing homes and other extended care facilities, bringing companionship and personal assistance to some 45,000 residents who might otherwise be lonely and isolated. At the same time, as many as 13,000 part-time RSVP volunteers will be serving as homemaker and health aids, enabling thousands of older persons to continue to live in their own homes. By using senior volunteers in a variety of programs, we can foster that human contact which brightens the lives both of those who are served and those who volunteer.

But other new steps are also needed in this area.

As one such step, the Congress should enact legislation which would enable the ACTION agency to expand person-to-person volunteer service programs for older Americans. These efforts would build on the successful experience of the Foster Grandparent program. One im-

portant characteristic of such programs is that so much good can be accomplished, so many people helped, for a relatively small dollar investment. It would indeed be tragic if we did not capitalize on this opportunity.

Measures are also needed to improve coordination among the many Federal and non-Federal volunteer activities which affect the aging. As one important step in this direction, the Administration on Aging and the National Center for Voluntary Action have enlisted the cooperation of 130 national voluntary organizations in a program to help older men and women in 300 communities live dignified lives in the familiar settings of their own homes. Too often, older Americans are displaced from such settings simply because small problems such as simple home repairs, shopping and trips to obtain health care have become too difficult. And yet, with only minimal assistance from volunteers, these problems could easily be met.

I have directed the ACTION agency to work in every possible way to help provide such assistance. Already, the RSVP program is moving forward in this area. I am confident that other ACTION program volunteers can also make a major impact in this field. It is my hope, too, that communities will consider the elderly residents of federally assisted housing projects as a source of volunteer manpower for serving other older persons.

As we move ahead with this entire program, we should take encouragement from successes of the past. One which is particularly noteworthy is the program in Mount Vernon and Edmunds, Washington, where local citizens have designed a unique bridge across the generation gap called STEP—Service To Elderly Persons. Under this program, volunteers from the local high schools have undertaken, on a regular basis, to assist elderly persons in performing small tasks, while at the same time providing them with companionship and renewed hope. Everyone gains from a program of this sort. If leaders at every level are alert to such possibilities, our progress can be enormous.

Often in quiet ways, the people of the United States have been responding to the challenges of our society with compassion and resourcefulness. Now it is for those of us who have the responsibility for national leadership to provide the Federal assistance which can help such voluntary efforts go even further and accomplish even more.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Discrimination based on age—what some people call "age-ism"—can be as great an evil in our society as discrimination based on race or religion or any other characteristic which ignores a person's unique status as an individual and treats him or her as a member of some arbitrarily-defined group. Especially in the employment field, discrimination based on age is cruel and self-defeating; it destroys the spirit of those who want to work and it denies the Nation the contribution they could make if they were working.

We are responding to this problem in

a number of ways. The Department of Labor, for example, has filed over 80 suits under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967—30 of which have been successfully concluded. I will soon propose to the Congress that this act be broadened to include what is perhaps the fastest growing area of employment in our economy—the State and local governments. I will also send a directive to the heads of all Federal departments and agencies reaffirming and emphasizing our policy that age shall be no bar to a Federal job which an individual is otherwise qualified to perform.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act relates to persons between the ages of 45 and 65. I recognize that persons falling within this age group are confronted with special problems in the employment area and that we should do everything we can to resolve these problems. It is also important, however, that we help open employment opportunities for persons over 65. To this end, I have requested the Secretary of Labor to urge the States and local communities to include older persons in the opportunities provided by the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, and to work with our public employment offices so that they will be in a position to help open job opportunities for the over 65 group, including opportunities for part-time employment in both the public and private sectors.

I also asked last fall that funds be doubled for special Operation Mainstream projects for low-income older workers—such as Green Thumb and Senior Aides. This measure can mean that as many as 10,000 older persons will be employed in activities that provide useful community service.

ORGANIZING FOR FUTURE ACTION

One of the important concerns of the White House Conference on Aging was the way in which the Government is organized to deal with the problems of older Americans. It was because I share this concern that I established my original task force on aging, appointed the first Special Assistant to the President on Aging and the first Special Consultant to the President on Aging, set up a new Cabinet-level Committee on Aging and called the White House Conference.

In a similar manner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has taken steps to ensure that the voice of older Americans speaks loud and clear within that Department. He has informed me that he will strengthen the Department's Advisory Committee on Older Americans and provide it with staff capability to support its increased responsibilities. The Commissioner of Aging, in his capacity as Chairman of the Advisory Committee, will report directly to the Secretary.

Another important organizational concern involves Government research activities which concern the process and problems of aging. It is important that the same scientific resources which have helped more people live longer lives now be applied to the challenge of making those lives full and rewarding for more Americans. Only through a wise investment in research now, can we be sure

that our medical triumphs of the past will not lead to social tragedies in the future.

What we need is a comprehensive, coordinated research program, one which includes disciplines ranging from biomedical research to transportation systems analysis, from psychology and sociology to management science and economics. To coordinate the development of such a program, a new Technical Advisory Committee for Aging Research will be created in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A GENERATION NO LONGER FORGOTTEN

We all grow old; the younger generation today will be the older generation tomorrow. As we address the needs of older Americans, therefore, we are truly acting in the best interest of all Americans. The actions and proposals which have been outlined in this message are designed to address those needs and meet those interests.

When I spoke about the problems of the elderly back in 1968, I described our older citizens as "an entire generation of forgotten Americans." But since that time, as this message clearly demonstrates, that situation has sharply changed. Today, it can truly be said that at all levels of Government and in all parts of the country, "the aging have come of age." Much work still remains, to be sure, but we can conclude with assurance that the aging are forgotten no longer.

Just before the First World War, one of the brilliant young writers of that day penned a line which has since become a hallmark of the period: "It is the glory of the present age," he wrote, "that in it one can be young."

Since that time, the generation of which he wrote has come through a troubled and challenging time—through two World Wars and a Great Depression, through the difficult experiences of Korea and Vietnam. The members of that same generation have led this country through a time of social and economic change unparalleled in world history. And they have come through all of these challenges "with colors flying." Because of their success, we now have the opportunity to complete their quest for peace and justice at home and around the world.

At such a moment, one obligation should be very high on our list of priorities: our obligation to this older generation. Let us work to make ours a time of which it can be said, "the glory of the present age is that in it men and women can grow old"—and can do so with grace and pride and dignity, honored and useful citizens of the land they did so much to build.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 23, 1972.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the

program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan, we have concluded the legislative program for this week, and I will ask permission to go over until Monday in a few minutes.

The program for next week is a relatively short program because of the Easter recess.

Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills.

The first bill to be considered will be H.R. 11896, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, under an open rule with 4 hours of debate. If we complete action on that bill by Tuesday night or Tuesday afternoon late we will consider on Wednesday H.R. 13188, the Coast Guard authorization, subject to a rule being granted, and H.R. 13324, the maritime authorization, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. With the consideration of the rule on Monday for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, and 4 hours of general debate, would the gentleman from Louisiana anticipate we would begin to read the bill for amendment on Monday?

Mr. BOGGS. I would not. I would anticipate we would not begin to read the bill for amendment until Tuesday.

Of course, conference reports may be called up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

The Easter holiday recess will begin at the close of business on Wednesday, March 29, and continue until Monday noon, April 10.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business scheduled for Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE FAA DICTATES—PART 7

(Mr. KARTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I approach this final comment in my series of reports on the arrogance of the FAA Administrator, Mr. John H. Shaffer, with some weariness. This feel-

ing is not brought about by research involved in compiling this report or its writing. Rather it is from the certain feeling that although this is the last of my series it will no doubt not be the end of the Administrator's meddling and intervention in the question of a second airport in the Twin Cities. Mr. Shaffer has gone back on his word before to me and I seriously doubt that the exposure of his conduct through my reports to the House will deter him from future pressure tactics.

If there is any cause for optimism it is from the assurances from the local officials involved that they will resist intimidation from Mr. Shaffer. As I said before I have never questioned Mr. Shaffer's right to express a "professional" opinion on a matter involving aviation and the Twin Cities. I do question his right continually to bludgeon local officials and to break his repeated pledges of neutrality.

The other note of optimism arises from the feeling that through these reports I have alerted our colleagues in the House to the threat that Mr. Shaffer represents. If nothing else this series has informed our colleagues of what to expect if a Member of the House finds himself on the opposite side of a question with Mr. Shaffer.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by some of our colleagues, in the light of Mr. Shaffer's conduct in this affair, why I have not called for his resignation or his firing. I have not done this, Mr. Speaker, because the conduct of the Administrator which is notable for his incredible charges that those who oppose his views are "myopic, archaic, and have their heads in the sand," has stripped the Administrator of whatever influence that he might have.

While I have been constantly dismayed by his refusal to stay out of State and local matters his insistence upon butting in again and again has left him in the position of the boy who shouted "wolf" once too often. His bulldozing tactics have lost their effectiveness. With this being the facts of life there is no need to ask that Mr. Shaffer either resign or be removed from office—his actions have made it such that the office is now impotent so far as Twin Cities officials are concerned. The office might as well be vacant so far as making any difference to those who once sought his advice.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I conclude this story of the sorry and indefensible conduct that has been displayed by the Administrator. I end not on any note of elation for it is hardly a proud duty to document the arrogance of a Federal bureaucrat who occupies a responsible position of public trust. But it is a duty I felt necessary to perform so that others will be warned in the future.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE TX-786

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, many Members are growing concerned with the U.S. Postal Service. The new corporation has not yet proven they can give

better service, yet they have increased the rates.

To compound the irony, the Postal Service has fueled the fire by eliminating—for all practical purposes—the postmarks of colorful towns throughout the United States in favor of some numerical gibberish like TX-786.

I see no justification for destroying the facts and fictions and traditions which have grown up around such colorful postmarks in my district as Snook, Dime Box, Pflugerville, and Cat Spring. There is something basically wrong with a hardhearted or hardheaded bureaucrat who prefers a bunch of postmark numbers to Patman's Switch.

I think it is time the Congress assert itself in saving a little bit of Americana.

Recently, I prepared a newsletter on this subject and, in the hopes that more will join in this cause, I include that report now:

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE TX-786

That's what was postmarked on a letter that came in yesterday. It did not come from the Pacific Fleet or Henry Kissinger somewhere in China. It came from Schulenburg, Texas. It could have come from Pflugerville, Prairie Lea, Wimberley, or Bluffton.

In one fell swoop, the Postal Service has replaced local color, history, and pride with a set of numbers which might warm a mathematician's heart—but not a hometown booster's.

When I raised this question earlier, a news service ran the story on the national wire. I received sympathetic letters from throughout the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. Obviously, the people don't like being computerized.

The Postal Service in Washington attacked me as being "political."

Nuts.

Washington Postal Services officials say their job is to deliver the mail—period. I disagree. They—this new corporation—say someone in Snook can still get their local postmark. But I note that they have to go downtown to the Post Office, usually between certain hours, to do so. And a whole lot of the mail will still simply be "Postal Service number so-and-so."

I think a compromise could be worked out using both the U.S. Postal Service jargon and still retaining the local postmark. The small communities are the guts and backbone of this nation. Their fierce hometown pride should not only be preserved but encouraged.

Besides . . . how does J. Edgar Hoover trace an extortion letter from U.S. Postal Service IA503?

Footnote: Ever heard of Nameless, Texas? That's in our district. The name came from an earlier hassle with Washington. Nameless is not far from Trail's End and it used to be called Fairview. But, one of my constituents in a delightful letter last week writes: "Washington, D.C., wrote there was already a Fairview. Three or four names were suggested but were all turned down. The folks got mad and wrote back—let's be nameless, and be damned." And so the town was called Nameless. That's what the Postal Service apparently is trying to call all our towns.

Nuff said.

TAX BREAKS FOR HOMEOWNERS

(Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr.

Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would eliminate the tax benefits presently being received by slum landlords and which would provide a new tax deduction for average homeowners who make improvements in their residences.

For far too long we have been subsidizing the destruction of residential properties in our cities.

The average homeowner who cares enough about his neighborhood and his home to keep the property up gets no tax breaks. Instead, he is likely to be subjected to an increased assessment and, therefore, winds up paying higher taxes for having repaired his property. Yet, we give greedy, nonresident slumlords tax breaks in the nature of a depreciation allowance, whether or not they operate their buildings in compliance with the law.

My bill is designed to change that by giving assistance to the average guy who keeps up his home and denying depreciation allowances to nonresident owners who maintain their properties in violation of Federal, State, county, or municipal housing codes. It provides \$1,000 per year deduction for expenses incurred in having exterior painting, plastering, carpentry repairs, plumbing and heating work, electrical work, roofing, and painting done to owner occupied residential property. Any other similar items which lengthen the structural life or soundness of the building would also be covered.

The absurdity of our whole housing concept is that, after we have encouraged destruction with our tax policies, we then ask taxpayers to pay billions to correct our mistakes.

This absurdity must end. My bill is a step toward ending it.

The bill follows:

H.R. 14062

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements in owner-occupied residential property and to eliminate the property depreciation allowance for certain non-owner-occupied rental property.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section: "SEC. 218. REPAIR OR IMPROVEMENT OF TAXPAYERS' RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the ordinary and necessary expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair or improvement (including exterior painting, plastering, carpentry work, plumbing and heating work, electrical work, roofing and glazing, pointing, and any similar items which lengthen the structural life or soundness of the building) of the taxpayer's owner-occupied residential property.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—The deduction allowed a taxpayer under this section shall not exceed \$1,000 for any taxable year. (2) No deduction may be allowed under this section with respect to any capital expenditure."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out "SEC. 218. Cross references" and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 218. Repair or Improvement of Taxpayers' Residence.

"SEC. 219. Cross references."

(c) Section 62 of such code (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) Repair or Improvement of Taxpayers' Residence.—The deduction allowed by section 218."

(d) Section 167 (a) of such code (relating to depreciation) is amended by deleting the period at the end of subsection (2) thereunder and inserting "except non-owner-occupied residential rental property which is maintained in violation of Federal, State, county, or municipal housing codes or regulations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE 151ST ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks a milestone in the proud history of Greece. One hundred and fifty-one years ago, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots raised the flag of revolt against their Turkish oppressors. The cause of Greek independence immediately caught the imagination of the American people, and expressions of sympathy and solidarity were forthcoming from communities across our Nation. Although the Greek struggle for independence was long and bitter, the tide turned with the intervention of the British, French, and Russian navies at the Battle of Navarino on October 20, 1827, when the Turkish fleet was defeated and destroyed. Subsequently, a peace treaty was signed at Adrianople calling for Turkish recognition of Greek sovereignty. At long last, after more than 400 years of foreign domination, Greece was recognized as a free and independent nation.

During the next century, the Greeks devoted their efforts to establishing a stable government and to promoting economic stability and social progress. When they were threatened anew with the opening of World War II, again they showed their fierce devotion to freedom and independence. On October 28, 1940, Greece rejected the Fascist ultimatum to surrender. "Okhi!"—"No!"—was the Greek reply, and this famous response is remembered annually in the Okhi Day Holiday which celebrates the Greek determination to remain free.

The end of World War II brought no respite to the Greeks. Their country was devastated, and they faced a new threat within their borders in the form of armed Communist bands seeking to overthrow the Government. However, once more they showed courageous determination to preserve their liberty at all costs. The struggle against the Communist threat was aided substantially by America's pledge to assist the Greek people in their fight against the Communist rebels. America's pledge became popularly known as the Truman doctrine for it came in the form of an announcement on March 12, 1947, by former President

Harry S. Truman. At that time, Truman noted:

The valor of Greece . . . convinces me that the Greek people are equal to the task.

Finally, in 1949, America's faith was rewarded, for hostilities came to an end and the Greek struggle against the Communist forces was successfully concluded.

The ideal of democracy, born in ancient Greece over 2,000 years ago, has prevailed, and in fact, has inspired other nations in their struggle against oppressors. And the notable Greek contribution to philosophy, art, medicine, mathematics, drama, and countless other areas has influenced in large measure the course of history and the advancement of world civilization.

It is thus a pleasure to extend greetings to the Greek people in my own city of Chicago, in our Nation, and all over the world on the occasion of their Independence Day and to recall a century and a half of genuine friendship between the people of America and the people of Greece.

HIGH RETAIL BEEF PRICES BENEFIT NO ONE

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, March 17, I appeared before the Democratic Study Group's Consumer Task Force on Food Prices to discuss current beef prices. I pointed out that Kansas and Midwest beef producers were not the beneficiaries of high retail beef prices; that indeed prices for cattle on the hoof were no higher than they were 20 years ago while retail beef prices had risen from 40 to 70 percent.

This week Giant Food stores took full-page advertisements on a pro bono publico basis to advise consumers to buy substitute foods and boycott beef; that beef prices were the highest since the Korean war and that the problem was at the source, that is, the farmer.

That, of course, is a complete falsehood. Fortunately, the majority leader in the other body, the esteemed Senator from Montana, nailed this point in a statement Wednesday.

Yesterday I wrote Joseph Danzansky, president of Giant, and William S. Mitchell, president of Safeway Food Stores, in an effort to point out a few facts that they both conveniently overlooked. I also took occasion to call the matter to the attention of Mr. Newbold Noyes, editor of the Evening Star, in which the Giant full-page ad appeared. The Star is an estimable newspaper and I do not believe it would wittingly want to be a party to what is passed off as an institutional advertisement designed to inform the public which instead misleads the consumer buying meat at the retail counter.

Mr. Speaker, we are all consumers. None of us is happy with high prices for anything, including beef. Neither my wife nor Kansas beef producers are happy about high retail beef prices. I am simply fed up with this campaign to make the

beef producer the culprit when the entire price rise goes to the middleman—the processor and the packer and the wholesaler and the retailer.

Incidentally, I note that Secretary of Agriculture Butz is quoted in the Evening Star as having told some guests at the White House Tuesday evening:

Giant right now is getting a higher profit on poultry without reducing the price that it was getting on beef.

That is morality for you; urging housewives not to buy beef because you can make more profit on poultry!

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement before the Consumer Task Force, the text of my letters to Giant and Safeway and to the Evening Star at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HIGH RETAIL BEEF PRICES BENEFIT NO ONE (Statement of Hon. JOE SKUBITZ, Republican of Kansas, before the Consumer Task Force of the House of Representatives Democratic Study Group)

Thank you, Mr. Rosenthal. I am grateful to you for the opportunity to appear here at this hearing into food prices.

I don't want to be misunderstood. I am a consumer and I speak for consumers in my own District of Kansas. They too are suffering from high food prices and high meat prices and they too, like all of us, are looking for relief. Too many people who know that Kansas is an important beef producer, that livestock is the State's number one industry, jump to the conclusion that Kansans approve of these high retail beef prices.

The fact is that Kansas consumers and Kansas beef producers feel about high retail beef prices just as Mr. Rosenthal does, just as his New York housewives do, and just as my wife does.

Indeed, food prices are high not only in New York City and in Kansas but throughout the country. As a matter of fact, retail meat prices are actually higher in some stores in Kansas and Nebraska than they are in New York and Washington retail stores. High retail beef prices have not benefited and do not now benefit Kansas livestock producers by a single penny.

The high meat price culprit is higher processing costs, higher labor costs, higher transportation costs. These are the factors that have been directly responsible for retail meat price hikes that average more than 40% during the last twenty years. It is these factors and the invisible profit margins to those who handle meat from the day the animal leaves the slaughtering pen until it is picked up in a saran-wrapped fancy package on the chain store meat counter that are largely responsible for today's beef prices in the stores.

I aim to set the record straight, to document what has happened to livestock prices and retail meat prices over the past twenty years, and once and for all to remove the misplaced and unjustifiable blame placed on livestock growers for high retail meat prices.

I want to refute as emphatically as I can the mindless and totally unrelated suggestion now being heard in various quarters that the way to solve the meat price situation is to lift quotas on foreign beef and import it from Australia or Argentina or Mexico. The facts tend to prove that increases in beef supply, whatever their source, do not greatly affect the retail price. They do and will drive down the price of beef on the hoof for the American livestock producer with no benefit to the consumer.

Let us now look at a few figures. Twenty years ago, in 1952, cattle prices on the hoof stood at 140% of parity; in short, they were 40% higher to the cattleman than what had been established as a then-equitable

price based on all other existing comparable costs. In January of 1952 the average price for cattle on the hoof was about \$35 per hundred weight. Some higher grades brought \$39 a hundred.

Now 20 years later, cattle on the hoof were selling a week ago at 88% of parity, a price 52% lower relatively than the cattle producer received for his beef 20 years ago. Indeed, the average slaughter price for beef in Kansas last month was \$32.60 per hundred weight. The price has since dropped another \$1.20 a hundred to \$31.40. Cattlemen in Kansas this past week got 15% less for their average beef than was paid 20 years ago.

Match that price fact with anything else you buy!

Now let's look at the comparative retail prices of beef in the stores twenty years ago and now. I asked the Bureau of Labor Statistics for a compilation of average retail beef prices in New York and Washington on the nearest identical dates for the same cuts of beef. Let me read them to you.

Here are the New York comparative prices:

	March 1952	January 1972	Percent increase
Round steak.....	\$1.18	\$1.71	47
Rib roast.....	.85	1.16	40
Chuck roast.....	.77	.81	7
Hamburger.....	.66	.93	49
Here are the Washington comparative prices:			
Round steak.....	1.13	1.42	29
Rib roast.....	.88	1.22	40
Chuck roast.....	.76	.80	7
Hamburger.....	.66	.69	5

I might note that since hamburger varies so widely in quality, the indicated price increase is probably not significant.

Perhaps a more valid and meaningful comparison may be derived by scanning newspaper advertisements in the two cities 20 years ago and recently. After all, these are the prices that the consumer pays at the meat counter.

So, while the price of beef at the farm remained static, what happened to the retail price at the friendly neighborhood chain store in New York and Washington. Well, let's look at the record, the newspaper advertisements.

In New York, according to advertisements in the New York News of March 3, 1952, chuck roast was selling for 69¢ a pound at the A & P and Safeway; rib roast was quoted at 79¢ a pound at Safeway; ground beef at 65¢ a pound at both stores; pot roast at 85¢ and round pot roast at 97¢.

In Washington, on March 1, 1952, Giant in an advertisement in the Washington Post quoted rib roast at 71¢, chuck roast at 61¢, ground beef at 59¢, sirloin and round steak at 87¢ and porterhouse steak at 97¢ a pound. Acme and Food Fair prices on the same cuts, when advertised, were identical on that day.

Now, let's look at the prices for the same cuts of beef, the same advertisements in the same newspapers in some of the same stores in 1972, twenty years later.

In the New York News of February 14 and 16, ground round was \$1.09 per pound at Daltch-Shopwell and Bohacks, an increase of about 70% over twenty years ago. Chuck roast was quoted only by Daltch's and at 99¢ per pound, an increase of 42%. Round roast, priced by Bohacks, ranged from \$1.29 for the bottom roast to \$1.39 for the top round, an increase of from 32% to 42% from the ordinary pot roast of 20 years back.

Unfortunately, a detailed comparison, cut by cut, is not possible since all four stores checked in New York—Grand Union, Bohacks, A & P and Daltch-Shopwell—advertised new and entirely different cuts than in former years—another device which permits the price to be raised to the consumer.

The story is about the same in Washington. In the March 6 advertisements in the Washington Post, chuck steak was 99¢ a pound in two stores and 98¢ in one, an increase of approximately 60%. Rib roast was quoted at 99¢ a pound at the A & P, a relatively modest increase of just under 40%. Safeway quoted ground beef at 69¢ a pound, and Magruder's and Acme priced ground chuck at 89¢ a pound, an increase in ground beef of 20% and of ground chuck of approximately 40%. Safeway posted rib roast on March 9, at \$1.49 a pound and Magruder's had the same cut at \$1.09 compared with Giant's 71¢ a pound 20 years ago, increases of 103% and 70% respectively.

I won't burden the record further. I think the point is clear. Retail meat prices, laying aside differences in cuts, are on the average at least 40% higher today than they were 20 years ago in our large eastern metropolitan areas.

Labor costs have jumped enormously at the processing and packing plants and in the retail stores. Hourly wages in packing plants have gone up 44% in the last decade alone while hourly wages in retail groceries and butcher stores have jumped 48% in the past ten years. The housewife is paying for these costs in the added price for beef. Transportation costs have soared tremendously and again the consumer is paying for that in the retail cost of beef.

Mr. Rosenthal, in his statement in the February 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, included an editorial from the New York Post critical of Secretary Butz's suggestion that a consumer boycott of meat prices will bring down prices. The New York Post editorial suggested more foreign beef imports to stop American livestock producers from fattening their profits!

Some fattening! Some profits!

The Post, incidentally, has raised the newsstand price of its paper 200% in the same twenty year period. Would it be fair to suggest that this is price gouging? Of course not. The Post doesn't have to convince anyone that its labor costs and its newsprint costs and all its other costs probably went up 100% or more to justify the present 15¢ per copy as compared with 5¢ a copy in 1952.

One wonders why the Post, in its wisdom, is so willing to charge the cattle producers with making high profits when, unlike the Post, their selling price today is actually lower than it was 20 years ago.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that cattle prices at the slaughtering pens are today lower than they were twenty years ago. Why?

Simply because the cattle grower had to meet the same inflationary spiral, the same increased costs of labor, the same rise in transportation costs that the New York Post had to meet and that all American business has had to meet.

Unfortunately, unlike the Post, the cattle producer has not been able to pass on the added cost. To bring them to market, his cattle cost him the same 40% to 60% more in labor and feed prices but he gets no more for them because he is paid what the packing house corporations and conglomerates dictate.

The answer must be obvious even to the least informed. The increased cost in meat at retail—that tremendous spread in price between what is paid the grower on the farm and what the housewife pays at the butcher counter—has gone to the middlemen. That 40%, 50% and even 100% margin went to the people between the farmer and the housewife and the people who work for them.

Mr. Rosenthal expressed it well when he said that "... the sad thing about this food price increase is that the individual farmer will probably see very little of the money because it will be going to the agribusiness corporations including the packers and processors."

If we are going to look into what has happened to food prices these past 20 years, and specifically beef prices, I suggest that this investigation zero in on national wage policies. Basic farm prices just have not been a factor in the food price rises of recent years.

Price controls and raising beef import quotas will not, in my judgment, reduce meat prices at retail. Meat consumption in this country has risen from 60 pounds per capita 20 years ago to 117 pounds per capita this past year and our cattle ranchers and feeders continue to increase production to meet demand without having increased the slaughter price.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a remarkable accomplishment and one to be commended. What we need in this country, and in my State of Kansas, is further encouragement to the beef producers to produce and market more cattle. They need better prices to meet increasing costs.

I suggest Mr. Rosenthal, that the time has come for consumer advocates and leaders like yourself to launch a crusade to reduce that middleman spread and bring prices down where they belong, based on what the grower is now getting for his cattle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1972.

MR. JOSEPH B. DANZANSKY,
President, Giant Foods, Inc.,
Lanham, Md.

DEAR MR. DANZANSKY: Giant Foods' full page advertisement in yesterday's (March 21) Evening Star amazes me and all informed persons. If your "consumer advisor", Mrs. Peterson, is responsible I suggest that she be a bit more careful of her facts and that you, as one who prides himself on being a public spirited citizen, pay somewhat more attention to the facts before approving new public policies for a major food supplier in this area.

Item. Why don't you compare beef prices on the hoof today with those of 20 years ago? You will find that the price per hundred weight is actually lower than in 1952.

Item. Why don't you compare Giant's retail prices for a series of beef cuts yesterday with those for the same cuts twenty years ago. You will find that they range from 40% to 70% higher.

Item. Why don't you tell the consuming public who is getting this 40% to 70% markup; why not explain graphically just how the housewife's dollar spent for beef is being distributed and to whom?

Item. Why not attempt to deal factually and intelligently with the wage spiral over the past twenty years as a major factor in the increased cost of meat to the consumer and its effect on meat prices by the packer and processor and by you as the retailer.

Item. Why use such an inflammatory and misleading statement that "beef is at the highest level since the end of the Korean war" and "it begins at the source" which is designed to suggest that the reason for high meat prices in your stores is because cattle prices on the farm are high. Wouldn't it have been more honest to put the facts in proper perspective?

a. For example. Twenty years ago beef prices paid to the producer by the packers were 140% of parity; today they are at 88% of parity or less. Does that indicate that the beef producer is the mercenary culprit? Even Mrs. Peterson must understand that all prices and wages have changed in twenty years and that parity is merely a reflection of existing costs and prices. Is it fair to suggest that the beef producer is supposed to absorb the increased costs for labor and feed over the past twenty years and should now sell his beef for less—52% less in relative parity levels than he did twenty years ago?

b. Last Friday Omaha prices for prime live steers were \$35.75 a hundred pounds, down \$1 a hundred for the week and down \$2.40

a hundred for the twenty-year high in January. Kansas prices for average beef ranged around \$32 a hundred pounds. Nevertheless, cattle shipments of 23,000 head at the 11 major terminals were 30% greater than a week ago. In the preceding week, 600,000 cattle were slaughtered at the federally inspected packing plants, 19,000 more than the previous week and the largest volume in more than two months. Does this look like the beef producer is the greedy culprit holding back his product for higher prices?

Item. Why not tell consumers why meat prices at retail gyrate widely, sometimes from day to day or week to week; why Giant has "specials" on certain meats or cuts of meat every other day. Wouldn't it be more honest to explain that the control of meat prices rests largely with the packers and processors who determine the prices paid for cattle and the price the retailer pays them? Wouldn't it be fair to explain that their daily and weekly quotations to you affect and control your prices to the consumer?

I am not disputing your right to buy full page advertisements, nor the Star to accept them, to suggest that consumers buy meat substitutes, particularly if Giant does not enjoy the margin of profit on beef that it does on fish or poultry or cheese. But you have no right, in my judgment, to suggest that a boycott of beef by consumers is the appropriate manner in which to bring the farmer to heel when he is today relatively worse off economically than any segment of our economy.

As a busy man, involved in all sorts of community enterprises, I doubt that you would have the time to read the text of my recent statement on retail beef prices before the Rosenthal subcommittee of the Democratic Study Group. But perhaps you could suggest that Mrs. Peterson and your advertising people glance through it before they prepare additional so-called public interest advertisements.

Regretfully yours,

JOE SKUBITZ.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1972.

Mr. WILLIAM S. MITCHELL,
President, Safeway Stores, Inc.,
Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: As president of Safeway Stores, Inc., I presume you are knowledgeable about, and perhaps responsible for, Safeway advertising suggesting that current beef prices are inordinately high and that consumers boycott meat purchases and buy substitute protein food. Could I suggest that it would be prudent to be a bit more careful of the facts, all of the facts, so that the buying public will not be misled.

Safeway particularly, as a feeder, slaughterer and retailer, in effect a vertical conglomerate in this field, should exercise special caution since it, as the complete middleman knows where the spread goes between slaughter prices and retail beef prices at the Safeway counter.

Item. Why don't you compare beef prices on the hoof today with those of 20 years ago? You will find that the price per hundred weight is actually lower than in 1952.

Item. Why don't you compare Safeway's retail prices for a series of beef cuts yesterday with those for the same cuts twenty years ago. You will find that they range from 40% to 70% higher.

Item. Why don't you tell the consuming public who is getting this 40% to 70% markup; why not explain graphically just how the housewife's dollar spent for beef is being distributed and to whom?

Item. Why not attempt to deal factually and intelligently with the wage spiral over the past twenty years as a major factor in the increased cost of meat to the consumer and its effect on meat prices by the packer, processor and the retailer and by you as all three plus a feeder and producer.

Item. Why use such inflammatory and misleading statements designed to suggest that the reason for high meat prices in your stores is because cattle prices on the farm are higher. Wouldn't it have been more honest to put the facts in proper perspective?

a. For example. Twenty years ago beef prices paid to the producer by the packers were 140% of parity; today they are 88% of parity or less. Does that indicate that the beef producer is the mercenary culprit? Even Safeway must understand that all prices and wages have changed in twenty years and that parity is merely a reflection of existing costs and prices. Is it fair to suggest that the beef producer is supposed to absorb the increased costs for labor and feed over the past twenty years and should now sell his beef for less—52% less in relative parity levels than he did twenty years ago?

b. Last Friday Omaha prices for prime live steers were \$35.75 a hundred pounds, down \$1 a hundred for the week and down \$2.40 a hundred from the twenty-year high in January. Kansas prices for average beef ranged around \$32 a hundred pound level. Nevertheless, cattle shipments of 23,000 head at the 11 major terminals were 30% greater than a week ago. In the preceding week, 600,000 cattle were slaughtered at the federally inspected packing plants, 19,000 more than the previous week and the largest volume in more than two months. Does this look like the beef producer is the greedy culprit holding back his product for higher prices?

Item. Why not tell consumers why meat prices at retail gyrate widely, sometimes from day to day or week to week; why Safeway has "specials" on certain meats or cuts of meat every other day. Wouldn't it be more honest to explain that the control of meat prices rests largely with the packers and processors who determine the prices paid for cattle and the price the retailer pays them? Wouldn't it be fair to explain that their daily and weekly quotations affect and control your prices to the consumer?

I am not disputing your right to buy full page advertisements, nor the newspapers to accept them, to suggest that consumers buy meat substitutes, particularly if Safeway does not enjoy the margin of profit on beef that it does on fish or poultry or cheese. But you have no right, in my judgment, to suggest that a boycott of beef by consumers is the appropriate manner in which to bring the farmer to heel when he is today relatively worse off economically than any segment of our economy.

As a busy man, I doubt that you would have the time to read the text of my recent statement on retail beef prices before the Rosenthal subcommittee of the Democratic Study Group. But perhaps you could suggest that others of your staff and your advertising people glance through it before they prepare additional so-called public interest advertisements.

Regretfully yours,

JOE SKUBITZ.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1972.

Mr. NEWBOLD NOYES,
Editor, *The Evening Star*,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NOYES: I am well aware that the editorial department does not concern itself with advertising—except, of course, to the extent that advertising helps keep a newspaper alive.

Nevertheless, it has occurred to me that in-depth news handling and fairness might suggest to the Food Page editor, or even to a discerning editorial writer, that the Giant advertisement referred to in my letter to Mr. Danzansky, and in similar advertisements by Safeway, is certainly misleading and may

not be entirely factual. A newspaper such as the STAR owes its readers more, I believe.

Sincerely,

JOE SKUBITZ.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM—LET US GET GOING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, by passing overwhelmingly earlier this week H.R. 13120, to modify the par value of the dollar, the Congress has constructively cooperated with the administration Phase I of international monetary reform.

I am confident that Congress will cooperate equally constructively with the vastly more important phase II of international monetary reform. This is the sense of the one agreed statement of all Members—Republican and Democratic—of the joint committee in its 1972 joint economic report, released today. While differences throughout the 150-page report by Republicans and Democrats, and by Members of each party, were deep and wide on almost every issue, all agreed in the following statement:

We must promptly start negotiations on longer term international monetary reform. We should explore the potential of utilizing such reform as a means to promote capital flows toward less developed countries. A reformed international monetary system should guarantee sufficient exchange rate flexibility.

To the same effect are the report's majority views on international economics, pages 59 to 67; the minority views, pages 126 to 136; and the additional views of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, pages 137 to 139.

This same view—that international monetary reform is needed, and that negotiations should start now—runs through the mainstream of international monetary utterances since the crisis of last August 15.

On September 13, 1971, the six of the European Economic Community—France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg—came on strong for a reconstruction of the international monetary system, stressing the modification of fixed parities, the growing reliance on "reserve instruments collectively created and managed internationally," and attention to "the needs of developing countries." Three days later, Japan, Canada, Great Britain, Sweden, and Switzerland, indicated their adherence to the declaration of the six.

The spirit of reform was reiterated—this time with the United States joining in—in the December 18, 1971, communique which followed the group of 10 Smithsonian meeting in Washington. That communique concluded:

The Ministers and Governors agreed that discussions should be promptly undertaken, particularly in the framework of the IMF, to consider reform of the international monetary system over the longer term. It was agreed that attention should be directed to the appropriate monetary means and division of responsibilities for defending stable ex-

change rates and for insuring a proper degree of convertibility of the system; to the proper role of gold, of reserve currencies, and of Special Drawing Rights in the operation of the system; to the appropriate volume of liquidity; to re-examination of the permissible margins of fluctuation around established exchange rates and other means of establishing a suitable degree of flexibility; and to other measures dealing with movements of liquid capital. It is recognized that decisions in each of these areas are closely linked.

The spirit of reform is thus bipartisan, multinational, desperately needed, and long delayed.

And what of the administration, and particularly the Treasury, where the responsibility lies?

Like a patient suffering with a fever, the Treasury's attitude toward reform comes in fits and starts, interspersed with periods of profound coma. There was the swashbuckling activity of August 15, followed by months of ambiguity and inaction. Then there were the great December moments at the Azores and the Smithsonian, followed again by months of innocuous desuetude.

Just in the last few days have come some overt and visible signs that the administration and the Treasury are again thinking about monetary reform. The Treasury's view on international monetary reform is that it is "wrestling with the complexities of this most complex subject."

All sorts of bold new ideas, undreamt of in the Smithsonian philosophy, are being floated. As reported in the New York Times of March 11, Secretary Connally is toying with "an idea for a future world economy divided openly and purposely into several major blocks."

Again, as reported in the Wall Street Journal of March 20, Secretary Connally advocates an "automatic discipline" against countries that run chronic surpluses in their balance of payments, a discipline which would require surplus countries to give up part of their excess monetary reserves to a special fund from which deficit countries could borrow. The idea was so new, reported the Wall Street Journal, that the Secretary has not yet been able to discuss it with his "key strategist," the Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs.

The principal thing holding the Treasury back, it appears, is its inability to decide on just whom to negotiate with.

I speak today, because I believe there is a proper forum for the negotiation of international monetary reform, one that should be convened without delay; that there is a proper subject matter for negotiation, with most of the technical details already well thought through; and that there is a proper timetable, one looking toward the practical achievement of monetary reform by the time of the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund-World Bank in Washington next autumn.

I shall discuss these questions of Reform—Who? Reform—What? and Reform—When? And I believe that the Congress will support constructive initiatives by the administration along the lines I project.

REFORM—WHO?

On the question of the proper parties and forum for negotiating international monetary reform—an obvious first order of priority—the Treasury's position, as stated in the Wall Street Journal of March 20, hints at simultaneous negotiations in three places:

One among the traditional "Group of Ten" key industrial countries, one in another group representative of the 20 nations on the executive board of the IMF, and a new group representing major power blocs.

Simultaneous negotiations with three vaguely overlapping groups sounds to me like a poor way to proceed. We do not have enough expert jugglers to keep three balls in the air at once. Neither does anybody else.

Apart from the dispersion of energy involved in simultaneous negotiations in three forums, two of the three forums suggested are poor ones. Secretary Connally himself has criticized the Group of Ten as being "limited to industrial nations and wealthy nations." He is quite right. With the UNCTAD countries about to assemble in an indignation meeting in Santiago, Chile, in the next few weeks, it does not make sense to pick a forum for monetary reform which would exclude them.

Likewise, to adopt the Treasury's obsession with "major power blocs" concedes too much to the curse of bigness. Why in the name of commonsense do we want to go around forming power blocs—European, Japanese, African, Latin America, or any other kind? Within the power bloc, they tend to set up a hateful master-slave relationship. Between and among the power blocs, they make for aggressiveness, when what is needed is cooperation.

That leaves the third Treasury suggestion—"another group representative of the 20 nations on the executive board of the IMF." While the suggestion is somewhat misleadingly put, it has great merit.

In fact, the International Monetary Fund, through its Managing Director Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, on January 24, 1972, unfolded in great detail an excellent plan for a ministerial group of 20 who between them would represent all the 120 countries of the IMF. Basically, this would simply involve an upgrading to the ministerial level of the present 20 executive director groupings. Some of the IMF executive directors, like the United States, represent but one major country. Others represent a group of countries, such as the Netherlands-Austria-Yugoslavia-Israel grouping. Still others represent a greater number of less developed countries, such as the executive director grouping for 18 African countries which have all emerged from French colonialism.

The IMF January 24 suggestion is that each of these 20 groups be a little club, with a head and some deputies which would give broad-scale representation—usually through finance ministers or central bank presidents—to the various countries in the grouping. Frequent rotations would insure fairness to all countries in the grouping.

The January 24 initiative has been well received in discussions between executive directors of the fund since January.

Here is a way to achieve unity through diversity. We ought to adopt the IMF suggestion tomorrow, and convene the new 20-member streamlined monetary parliament within the next few weeks. It should stay on the job until a reform is agreed upon, for presentation to the fund's governors and then for ratification by the Fund members.

REFORM—WHAT?

Once this 20-member group has convened, it needs an agenda. Here, again, the International Monetary Fund has been spending the months since August 15 most usefully. Its able staff has refined the issues and posed some answers on the whole gamut of problems involved in international monetary reform. Dozens of staff papers have culminated in the basic document "Reform of the International Monetary System—A Sketch of Its Scope and Content," dated March 7, 1972. The paper and its predecessors have been widely discussed by the executive directors and staff of the fund, and tentative agreement is beginning to emerge.

The document concerns itself with all the basic questions of monetary reform: How to bring about prompt changes in exchange rates; how to consolidate outstanding dollar and sterling balances into special drawing rights; how to finance balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses of reserve countries; how to attain symmetrical multicurrency intervention; how to make special drawing rights rather than gold the standard in which par values are expressed; how to provide an attractive rate of interest of special drawing rights; how to make the international monetary system better serve the needs of developing countries.

The March 7 "Sketch" could serve well as a starting point for the 20-member group negotiation. For the "Sketch" so to serve would not require that the United States agree with its every point. But negotiations must start somewhere, and the "Sketch" is a good place to start.

REFORM—WHEN?

Nothing concentrates a monetary expert's mind better than the knowledge that he is expected to produce something. The goal of a new monetary agreement by the September meeting of the Fund and Bank should do just that. If the broader questions of international monetary reform are pursued with the same zeal that attended the pursuit of the realignment of last December, there should be no difficulty in accomplishing what is needed in the 6 months between now and next fall.

Nobody—certainly not the United States—will win by further delay. Delay simply exposes the world to the danger of further monetary crises, to a return to autarchy and fragmentation. Let us move.

PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. HEINZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill that I believe will substantially reduce the flow of pornographic materials and will also protect individuals against invasion of privacy.

Many people find today that the privacy of their own home will not protect them or their children from receiving mail that is unsolicited, unwanted, objectionable, and in some cases obscene. This is a type of invasion of privacy that can and must be put to a stop.

Junk mail comes to many of us because our names have appeared on mailing lists which have been sold to commercial enterprises without our knowledge or consent.

The bill I present today, Mr. Speaker, is designed to protect the individual's right of privacy by prohibiting the sale or distribution of certain information. This particular bill, in effect, would give the individual the right to control what is known about him or her and insure that information collected for one purpose will not be used for another.

The right to privacy is one every American should enjoy. To deprive anyone of this right by denying control over what he or she receives through the mail should be illegal.

I hope the House will give this bill the immediate attention it deserves.

FEDERAL FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which I hope will help the Congress reassert its role in assuring Federal fiscal responsibility. I would like to take this opportunity, before giving details of the bill to commend the work of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. Bow) in working toward the goal of fiscal responsibility. His original proposal in 1970 helped generate my interest in this area.

For too long Congress has been talking too much about fiscal responsibility and doing too little about it. There are at least four major areas of needed reform: Congress must institute a total limitation framework on spending. Each Member of Congress has his own set of priorities, but generally they total up to more than the available revenues. By setting an annual spending limitation, Congress would finally face up to the limitation in available dollars.

Second, there has been a lack of predictability in funding. The Legislature has failed to pass appropriation bills on time and thus the agencies and departments have been forced to function on a costly and ineffective day-to-day basis.

Third, the Federal bureaucracy has often been slow in paying its own bills to local and private contractors, causing undue hardship and costs for the individual citizen.

Finally, the legislative branch has never asserted its rightful role in determining that once funds were authorized and appropriated they should be spent.

For too long the executive branch has held indiscriminate power to impound funds for specific programs and thus to subvert the intent of the Congress. The bill which I am introducing today, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972, moves toward the correction of these deficiencies. It is not a bill which may attract dramatic headlines, but I believe it could become a most significant instrument for meaningful congressional reform in the area of fiscal responsibility. It reaches out to the pressure points in the authorization-appropriation-expenditure cycle to develop more effective means of channeling Federal funds. Surely our taxpayers deserve this.

In the last few months my congressional office has received a large volume of mail requesting that I help to put Congress back on the road to fiscal responsibility.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972 has four titles. Title I moves the Federal fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year. This section will help Federal budget planners and Members of Congress in doing long range comprehensive planning for the budget. At the present time Members of Congress are forced to consider the 1,100-page budget document hurriedly if they want to decide on the budget before the beginning of a new fiscal year. In recent years this has forced Congress to pass a continuing resolution which allows an agency to operate while Congress finishes its appropriations process.

Title II of the bill requires Congress to establish an annual expenditure limitation. The Congress would be required to establish this limitation 45 days after the President's annual economic message. This would force Congress to consider our Federal budget in light of limited dollars and competing priorities.

Title III of the bill establishes a Federal impoundment procedure. It establishes two types of impoundment. The President may impound funds in a department or agency on a percentage across-the-board basis and must notify Congress immediately of this action. Either House of Congress then has 60 days to disapprove of the impoundment to force the President to stop the impoundment.

If the President decides to impound funds for a particular program in a department or agency without regard to the percentage limitations he must pre-notify the Congress of his intention and wait 60 days before proceeding with this special impoundment. Congress has been increasingly critical of impoundments which are targeted at particular programs. This requirement should help to limit this procedure.

The impoundment portion of the bill also includes a special section aimed at Federal officials who are unreasonably slow in disbursing funds to State and local units of government or to private contractors. If extra costs are incurred by the recipient of Federal funds because of a delay of 60 days or more, the Federal Government becomes liable for those extra costs.

The final section of the bill authorizes the Congress to undertake a study of budgetary and fiscal alternative pro-

cedures. Hopefully, this will allow Congress to continue in its upgrading of Federal budgeting procedures. In his fascinating book, "Politics of the Budgetary Process," Aaron Wildavsky states that:

The overriding concern of the literature on budgeting with normative theory and reform has tended to obscure the fact that we know very little about the budgetary process.

The study authorized in title IV of my bill should help us to gain the knowledge necessary to reevaluate our budgetary procedure for the future.

In the next few weeks I am hopeful that many of my colleagues will join me in supporting a reassertion of the integral role which the Congress should play in assuring Federal fiscal responsibility. The Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972 offers some positive solutions to problems in our budgeting system and I am hopeful that my proposals will receive thorough consideration this year.

I include a text of the bill and a title by title analysis of the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972 for the benefit of my colleagues.

H.R. 14057

A bill to assure greater Federal fiscal responsibility

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The Congress declares, that in light of the increasing complexity of the Federal Government, and in light of the Constitutional requirements for congressional involvement as an integral partner in the budgetary process and because of the recent modernization of the Executive Departments' budgetary procedure that

(1) The Congress should begin to consider the Federal budget and other fiscal policies in a systematic and analytical manner;

(2) The Congress should reestablish its primary role in developing the monetary and fiscal policies of the Government of the United States;

(3) The Congress should begin to examine alternatives to present budgeting and appropriations procedures to insure that it may consider budgetary and fiscal policies in a systematic and analytical manner;

(4) the Congress should begin to consider the budget in a comprehensive manner so that competing programs and departments can be considered in a unified budget strategy which recognizes the increasing demands on the Federal tax dollar;

(5) the Congress should establish budgetary and fiscal procedures which will assure the orderly and timely channeling of funds from the Federal Government to the States.

TITLE I—MODIFICATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR

SEC. 101. Effective with the second calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the fiscal year of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall be the calendar year.

SEC. 102. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized to make provision by regulation, order, or otherwise for the orderly transition by all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States affected by section 101 of this title from the use of the fiscal year in effect on the date of enactment of this Act to the use of the fiscal year prescribed by section 101 of this title.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL EXPENDITURES LIMITATIONS

Sec. 201. Except as otherwise provided in this title, the expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during each fiscal year shall not exceed that amount which the Congress shall fix by concurrent resolution no later than forty-five legislative days, as that term is used in title II of this Act, after the latest day set by law for the budget message of the President with respect to such fiscal year. In fixing such limitation, the Congress shall consider relevant economic indicators, program goals and budgetary considerations which will be helpful in establishing a comprehensive budget strategy.

Sec. 202. The limitation set by section 201 of this title shall be increased by an amount equal to any net increase in total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during such fiscal year with respect to relatively uncontrollable outlays under then existing law, open-ended programs and fixed costs.

Sec. 203. The limitation set by section 201 of this title shall also be increased by an amount equal to the net increase in receipts over the estimated receipts upon which such limitation was fixed.

Sec. 204. Not later than 15 days after the sine die adjournment of each session of the Congress, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the net effect of action or inaction by the Congress on total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) recommended by the President for the fiscal year following such session. If such estimate indicates that total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for that fiscal year would be in excess of the limitation established by section 201 of this title, as adjusted in accordance with sections 202 and 203, the Director shall specify in such report, for each activity for which he estimates expenditures and net lending to be in excess of the amount recommended therefor by the President, the pro rata reduction in expenditures and net lending required to comply with that limitation, as adjusted. Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for any such activity for that fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which would have been permitted by congressional action thereon, reduced by the amount specified in the Director's report.

Sec. 205. In the administration of any activity as to which (1) the obligational authority is reduced in order to effectuate reductions in expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) required by section 204 of this title, and (2) the allocation grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by the application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount remaining available for obligation after such reduction shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available. Neither the United States nor any of its officers shall be liable for any part of the difference between the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for any activity and the amount as so reduced.

TITLE III—ESTABLISHING A FEDERAL IMPOUNDMENT PROCEDURE

Sec. 301. (a) Whenever the President impounds any funds appropriated by law out of the Treasury for a specific purpose or project, or approves the impounding of such funds by an officer or employee of the United States, he shall, within ten days thereafter, transmit to the House of Representatives and the Senate a special message specifying

- (1) the amount of funds impounded,
- (2) the specific projects or governmental functions affected thereby, and

(3) the reasons for the impounding of such funds.

(b) Each special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each such message shall be printed as a document for each House.

Sec. 302. For purposes of this title, the impounding of funds includes—

(1) withholding or delaying the expenditure or obligation of funds (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise), appropriated for projects or activities, and the termination of authorized projects or activities for which appropriations have been made, and,

(2) any type of executive action which effectively precludes the obligation or expenditure of the appropriated funds.

Sec. 303. (a) Except as provided for in Section 304(c), the President shall cease the impounding of funds specified in each special message within sixty calendar days of continuous session after the message is received if such impounding shall have been disapproved by either House of Congress by passage of a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the impounding.

(b) The Provisions of this section and Section 304 shall be considered as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by this section; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(c) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) For purposes of this section and section 304, the continuity of a session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty day period.

(e) Any resolution of disapproval as provided for in subsection (a) of this section and in subsection (c) of section 304 shall be referred to the committee in each House whose responsibility includes the authorization of appropriations for the department or agency whose funds have been impounded.

Sec. 304. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the President shall not impound any funds from appropriations made by the Congress for any appropriations categories of any department or agency of the federal government unless such impoundment is made in all appropriations categories of that department or agency on the basis of equal percentage impoundment among appropriations categories.

(b) Variations of up to 10 percentage points in the impoundment of funds between individual appropriations categories within a department or agency shall not be deemed as unequal percentage impoundment among appropriation categories for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) In the event that the President desires to impound funds for a particular appropriations category within a department or agency without reference to the limitations established in subsections (a) and (b) of this section he shall submit a Presidential message as provided for in Section 301 of this act prior to any such impoundment. Either House of Congress shall have thirty days of

continuous session, from submission of the message, to disapprove by passage of a resolution stating that that House does not favor the proposed impounding in contravention of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. After such time the President shall be allowed to impound that appropriations category without regard to provisions in that section.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "appropriations category" means each designation of a use or program in the acts of Congress appropriating funds.

Sec. 305. Any costs which are incurred by the recipient of Federal funds as a result of delay, in disbursing such funds, in excess of sixty days after the date on which such recipient was to receive such disbursement according to notification from the appropriate Federal authority shall be reimbursed by the Federal Government. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction to hear and determine cases brought under this section. This section shall not apply to any costs incurred by the recipient of federal funds as a result of delay consequent to the impounding of such funds under this title.

TITLE IV—PROVIDING FOR AN ANALYSIS OF FISCAL PROCEDURES

Sec. 401. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a study of the impact of past, present, and anticipated appropriations procedures in the Congress, including the feasibility of two-year funding of some Federal programs.

Sec. 402. (a) There is established the Fiscal Responsibility Study Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall consist of:

- (1) The Comptroller General;
- (2) The chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives;
- (3) The ranking minority member of each of such Appropriations Committees;
- (4) The chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Finance; and
- (5) The chairman and the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

(b) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select from among themselves a Chairman, who may, under such rules as the Commission shall establish, appoint such staff at such salaries as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall—

- (1) study the impact of past, present, and anticipated appropriations procedures in the Congress;

(2) consider the feasibility of funding selected Federal programs on a two-year basis; and

(3) consider such other matters in their deliberations which will assist the Congress in attaining the ability to examine budgetary questions in a comprehensive manner.

(d) No later than December 31, 1973, the Commission shall report the results of its study to the Congress, together with such recommendations including recommendations for legislation, as it deems appropriate. Upon the filing of its report under this subsection, the Commission shall cease to exist.

TITLE BY-TITLE ANALYSIS

THE FEDERAL FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1972

Title I—Changing the Fiscal Year.

This title changes the Fiscal Year to coincide with the calendar year the second year after enactment.

Title II—Establishing Congressional Expenditures Limitations.

Congress is required to establish a limitation on expenditures 45 days after the President delivers his economic message to the

Congress. 15 days after the Congress adjourns sine die the Director of the Office of Management and the Budget is required to supply Congress and the President with his estimate of expenditures and if expenditures will exceed the limitation established he will specify the pro rata reductions required to bring expenditures within the limitation.

Title III—Establishing a Federal Impoundment Procedure.

This title creates two types of federal impoundment procedures. The first type of impoundment is called proportional impoundment. This procedure requires the President to notify the Congress in the event that he impounds funds on a proportional basis among appropriations categories in the department or agency where he impounds funds. The proportional impoundment limitation is not violated by variations among appropriations categories of up to 10%. Either House then has 60 days to disapprove of the impoundment for it to cease.

If the President decides to impound funds without regard to the proportional limitation in a department or agency, he must notify the Congress thirty days in advance of the proposed special impoundment. If either House of Congress does not disapprove of the special impoundment within the required time period the President can proceed with his special impoundment for the appropriations category of the department or agency.

One section in this title also indemnifies recipients of federal monies against excess costs incurred as a result of delays in disbursement from non-impounded funds in excess of sixty days.

Title IV—Authorizing a Study of Fiscal Procedures.

This title authorizes a study of fiscal procedures conducted by a commission composed of the Comptroller General and the leadership in each House of the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. The commission has a life of one year to study alternatives to present fiscal and budgetary procedures including the possibility of funding some programs on a two year basis. At the conclusion of the study the commission will report back to Congress with recommendations.

CRIME IN THE CITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great contributions of the city in the history of man has been the opportunity city life holds for dialog among men, for exchange of ideas, for development of the arts, and literature—in short, for the advancement of civilization. Every great civilization has had a great city.

But today we continue to face a problem that holds the seeds for destruction of the very essence of the city—the ease and availability of contact with other men.

The problem is crime—crime that has distorted and perverted the way we live and the way we react to our fellow man.

I know of a doctor who has told his wife she must not drive into Washington, D.C., after dark. And she has insisted that he always ride with a dog on his night rounds.

Most of the women volunteers who help my staff from time to time will not come into Washington after dark to

work at my office, and most resist coming into town even during the day.

In New York—I was there recently for subcommittee hearings on the problem of illegal aliens—in New York, the Broadway theaters have moved up their starting times to help people get off the streets and home earlier at night. But they are having attendance problems because the people just do not want to come into the heart of Manhattan at night.

My good friend Barry Farber, the radio personality, has been inundated with mail from people who are fed up with crime and who are supporting his efforts to launch a campaign against crime.

Not only are people afraid to go for a walk in their neighborhood after dark all across this Nation, they are afraid in their own homes. People are increasingly afraid to stop and help a stranded motorist. They avoid getting involved. Not long ago a young girl, half naked, ran out of the woods along Pennsylvania Avenue, screaming for help. It is estimated that between 300 and 400 people must have seen her and not one person stopped. The girl was found the next morning—raped and murdered.

Last year in Texas a serviceman was shot in a suburban neighborhood. He ran from house to house pounding on doors, begging someone to give him help, asking someone to call a doctor. Not one person answered the door. Every resident waited until he had moved down the block and then peered through partly opened doors to watch his progress. When the police finally arrived on the scene, the man lay dead in the middle of the street.

Just how serious and widespread the problem of crime is, I think, was evident in the article on crime which appeared not too long ago in Life magazine. In that issue Life presented the questionnaire responses of 43,000 readers. The survey provides strong evidence of how widespread the fear of crime is.

Life pointed out that three-fourths of those who responded worry about their safety in their own homes. The questionnaire also asked the respondents if they feel safe on the streets of their community at night. Sixty-one percent replied, "no." In cities of over half a million, the number of "no" answers rose to 80 percent.

A great deal of this fear is justified by experience. More than four out of 10 respondents reported that they or a member of their family have been victims of a crime within the past year. In cities of over a million, almost three out of five said they had been the victim of a crime.

The question is: What can we do about crime and the poison it spreads through a community?

Well, I think we have found part of the solution in the District of Columbia. Through a combination of providing large amounts of money for more and better police protection, strengthening the laws against crime and by reorganizing the courts through the District of Columbia Crime Act we have made dramatic progress in curbing crime in the District of Columbia.

In the last year since the beefing up

of the police department and implementation of the Crime Act, which I was privileged to help move through the House, crime decreased by about 13 percent. In January crime hit a 5-year low and then in February set another new 5-year low.

Part of that success is due to the reorganization of the court system which has dramatically reduced court backlogs and insured swift prosecution of criminals.

Since its peak in June 1970, the Washington court backlog of felonies has been reduced by 80 percent. Last year the U.S. attorney's office returned about 4,000 indictments, nearly double the average number of indictments for the last 20 years when the U.S. attorney's office was downgrading felonies to misdemeanors because of the court backlogs.

No longer can a criminal commit a crime in Washington and feel that, even if he is caught, he will not have to face a serious penalty. That is a powerful deterrent to crime.

The District of Columbia Crime Act also nearly doubled the number of judges, allowed the hiring of 25 more assistant U.S. attorneys and created the Public Defender Service.

The result has been a decrease in crime. And, in my opinion, the District of Columbia crime bill should be a model for the Nation. Similar national legislation, I think, would be a major step in our fight against crime, but much more is necessary.

In my home county of Prince Georges for example, where there has been a disturbing increase in crime in the past few years, there appears to be a need for additional police officers. Washington, D.C., with 760,000 residents, has about 5,000 police officers. Prince Georges County, with 670,000 residents, has 630 county police officers. And the various municipalities have an estimated total of 265 part-time and full-time officers. That makes a total of about 900 police officers for a sprawling county that is farther from tip to tip than Washington is from Baltimore.

As part of an attempt to help the Prince Georges County police, I have sponsored legislation which would allow a Prince Georges policeman to pursue into the District of Columbia, anyone he has reason to believe has committed a criminal offense.

Because of current restrictions on pursuit, there are frequently times when county law enforcement officers have to stop at the District line and watch criminals slip away.

For example, last year a Prince Georges police officer spotted a man driving with an obscured license tag and when he tried to stop the car the driver tried to outrun him. Fortunately the officer was able to stop the man before he could cross into the District of Columbia and escape.

When the officer went to ticket the driver, he discovered that the driver was a suspect in an armed robbery, and inside the car he found a wig, a gun, a bag full of money and a note stating:

This is a holdup. Give me your tens and twenties.

If the officer had not been able to stop the driver before the county line, an armed robber would have escaped. My legislation would close that escape route.

On the national level there are some other steps we can take to combat crime. Drug addiction and drug-related crime are areas we must attack.

The President has just signed into law a \$1 billion drug bill which I supported and spoke in favor of in the House.

The law establishes a Special Action Office in the White House for drug prevention. The Office will organize coordinated efforts across the country to combat drug abuse.

Under the law a national center for training in drug prevention techniques will be established; treatment and rehabilitation of victims will be increased and improved; research will be conducted for a substitute for methadone in dealing with heroin addiction; and grants will be provided for State drug programs.

Enactment of the drug bill was especially gratifying to me because I have sponsored similar legislation as a member of the Republican Task Force on Drug Abuse.

I believe this bill is an important step in our battle against drugs and drug addiction, but I believe much more must be done, and I pledge that I will continue to work toward legislation which would provide for involuntary commitment of any individual a court determines is an addict. The commitment would be, in effect, a quarantine of a sick person whom we must take out of society and help to get well for his sake and society's sake.

I am also sponsoring legislation which calls for mandatory jail sentences with no possibility of parole for nonaddict pushers. Harsher penalties must be levied on pushers.

In an effort to keep runaway youths from having to turn to crime to sustain themselves, I am also sponsoring the runaway youth bill. The bill would provide youths with a place to stay briefly, strengthen the interstate reporting methods on runaways, provide notification to parents of the location of their children and offer counseling services to the youths and their families.

Those are some of the directions we are moving in to combat crime—increased police protection, streamlining of the courts, combating drug addiction and drug-related crime, and helping runaway youth. But there is one other area of crime control which demands our attention. That is America's prison system.

As John Mitchell said not too long before he resigned as Attorney General:

The state of America's prisons comes close to a national shame. No civilized society should allow it to continue. . . . Four out of every five felonies committed in the United States is the work of a person with a criminal record. And two out of every three men released from prison are back in trouble with the law again in a very short time.

Mr. Mitchell put the case very bluntly. It does only limited good to train and equip our police forces or streamline our judicial system if our prisons are turning out criminals faster than they can be

rounded up and tried. Until we bring our corrections systems into the 20th century, our other efforts will be frustrated.

In fiscal 1971 the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided more than \$100 million to States and other units of government—solely to improve corrections.

And in fiscal 1972 the figure will be more than double that, coming close to a quarter of a billion dollars. That represents almost 100 times as much as we spent on corrections reform 3 years ago.

The Safe Streets Act has provisions which require, in effect, that States virtually double their corrections spending. Furthermore, this legislation reflects the latest in corrections thinking, and requires that the money be spent on modern, community-based systems—not on perpetuating the old fortress-type prisons.

And we must learn to use the time a man serves in prison to equip him to live a useful life in the community.

If we can accomplish these goals, coupled with drug control, better police protection, and streamlined courts, then I think we are on our way to halting the spread of crime.

The "crime" of crime is what it does to man and his relationships with other men. We must be able to live without fear so that we can live as man should live—freely, openly, and dedicated to the service of one another.

NATIONAL STANDARDS NEEDED FOR SAFE DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have been working for the past 2 years for national drinking water standards were heartened by the recent testimony of Robert W. Fri, Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, before the Senate Subcommittee on Environment. In the course of his statement, Mr. Fri gave EPA's endorsement for legislation which would have the Administrator of EPA set national drinking water standards for all health-related aspects of drinking water.

This endorsement of the principle of national standards may well remove the last impediment to House consideration of this legislation, which now rests in the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), who is chairman of that subcommittee, took the leadership on the question of safe drinking water last May, when his subcommittee held extensive hearings on H.R. 1093, sponsored by Chairman ROGERS and several members of his subcommittee, and H.R. 437, the Pure Drinking Water Act, which I introduced in this Congress.

During those hearings, Administrator Ruckelshaus, of the Environmental Protection Agency, stated that EPA could not support the legislation pending be-

fore the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Mr. Ruckelshaus indicated that EPA would continue its study of problems relating to drinking water supplies and would consider the need for both administrative and legislative actions. We are not exceptionally pleased to see that EPA has indeed concluded that national standards are necessary to insure the safety of drinking water, and the way is clear for expeditious House consideration of legislation which would insure that the best available technology is used to protect against chemical, bacteriological and viral pollution of drinking water.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to insert in the RECORD at this time the remarks of the Honorable Robert W. Fri, Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency:

STATEMENT BY HON. ROBERT W. FRI

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity of appearing before this Committee to testify on EPA's program for the protection of drinking water and to discuss Amendment 410 to S. 1478, the proposal relating to that program.

The Federal government's responsibility for protecting drinking water is centered in the Environmental Protection Agency, which inherited this authority from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1970. Historically, this program has been based on the Federal responsibility for preventing the spread of communicable diseases in interstate commerce, pursuant to the Public Health Service Act. Under this Act, EPA enforces regulations which preclude interstate carriers from utilizing water from sources which have not complied with certain required drinking water standards.

Regulations adopted under that authority are used to enforce standards for those systems which serve interstate carriers; presently, this enforcement authority applies to 665 out of an estimated 30,000 public water supply systems serving both large cities and small towns and applies only as such water is used by interstate carriers.

Under that authority drinking water standards have been established. These U.S. Public Health Service Standards, last revised in 1962, contain certain mandatory limits and recommended limits concerning physical characteristics and chemical and biological constituents affecting the quality of the water. Our regulations concerning drinking water also deal with requirements for effective control programs to limit the future risk potential of structural or operational defects of water supply systems.

Violations of the mandatory aspects of the Standards lead to prohibition of the use by interstate carriers of water drawn from that system pending the application of additional treatment or the development of an additional drinking water source. The Standards impose these mandatory limits on levels of coliform bacteria, arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, cyanide, lead, fluoride, selenium, and silver intake which can clearly affect the health of the user.

In addition, the Standards recommend limits on certain physical characteristics and chemical constituents of drinking water which are primarily of aesthetic concern in that they impart undesirable taste and odors to the water, cause discoloration of plumbing fixtures and the like.

Since the jurisdiction of our existing program is limited to those water supply systems serving interstate carriers, our enforcement covers only half of the 160 million people served by community water supply systems. We would point out, however, that most large cities and the States use the

Standards in regulating the quality of their drinking water supplies. An extrapolation of the Community Water Supply Study, a field inspection and evaluation of 969 community water supply systems conducted by HEW in 1970, indicated that approximately 5.4 percent of the national population or 8 million people are served water that is potentially dangerous in that it fails to meet the mandatory standards set by the Federal government. These 8 million people receive unsafe water from an estimated 5,000 of the nation's community water supply systems surveyed in the Community Water Supply Study. In the majority of cases these deficient systems are smaller systems serving smaller communities. In relation to this, national health figures indicate that during the ten-year period from 1961 to 1970, there were at least 128 known outbreaks of diseases or poisoning attributed to drinking water.

While the Community Water Supply Study shows that most Americans are receiving drinking water that meets health standards, it also indicates that many of our Nation's water supply systems are subject to potential problems because individual water supply systems contain structural or operational defects; because they are manned by improperly trained personnel; and because many State and local control programs are inadequate. As a result of the inadequacies in State surveillance programs revealed by the 1970 Community Water Supply Study.

We are evaluating nine additional State control programs, we have also been reviewing the manpower and training needs required to administer public water supply programs at the State and local levels of government. We believe, as a result of the Community Water Supply Study, that a lack of trained personnel is one of the greatest problems in insuring an adequate and safe water supply for the public. We have determined that the States employ about 300 engineers in water supply activities, which is about one-third the number which we believe is needed to support an effective program at the State level.

EPA is also conducting a research program to provide a better scientific base to assure safe and aesthetically acceptable drinking water for public consumption. The research includes inquiry into such areas as identification and evaluation of disease producing and toxic agents that may appear in drinking water supplies, development and evaluation of water treatment processing, and development of simple and rapid methods of detection and quantification of bacteria, virus, chemicals, and toxic agents in water.

The Community Water Supply Study showed that poor operating and surveillance procedures and inadequate physical facilities, while more prevalent in smaller communities, exist in all types and sizes of water supply systems, in both large cities and small towns.

Our concern is to assure the application of adequate and up-to-date standards of quality for safe, healthful drinking water and that water supply systems are in fact reliable in delivering safe water supplies. This objective necessarily entails the use of trained and competent staffs for operating and maintaining the systems so as to deal with difficulties of the individual water system in an effective manner. We believe that this effort should and must be implemented at the State and local level.

Although our study and analysis is not yet completed, several deficiencies have clearly emerged in the over-all national approach to providing safe public drinking water supplies. First, the application of Federally enforceable standards is not broad enough to cover all community water supply systems. Second, State and local control programs, because of deficiencies in their plan-

ning, training, and enforcement activities are not providing adequate regulation of local water supply systems. Finally, from a reliability standpoint, many of the systems themselves are not capable of delivering drinking water capable of delivering drinking water of acceptable quality on a continuing basis because of their lack of adequate facilities and sufficient numbers of trained personnel.

In view of these shortcomings, we have concluded that Federal legislation is needed to address certain aspects of the overall situation. As a result we are recommending to the Committee what we believe to be the essential ingredients for legislation to correct the problems of providing safe, reliable supplies of drinking water.

Such legislation should in our view contain the following elements:

1. The Administrator should be authorized to set National drinking water standards, which would be addressed to all health related aspects of drinking water. These standards would limit the chemical, biological, radiological, or other health related contaminants that might appear in drinking water. The standards would also include requirements for the operation and maintenance of water supply systems insofar as necessary to assure achievement of the health related limits described above. We believe that the setting of such standards should be a Federal responsibility because standards needed to protect health do not vary with locality and the Federal Government can bring greater resources to assess the complex health and technical aspects involved.

2. The application of such standards should be clearly limited to drinking water supplied, and not to raw water sources. Extending the purview of standards beyond the goal of upgrading the quality of drinking water and supply systems would be a duplication of the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, under which standards have already been established and would continue to be established relating to such raw water sources.

3. In addition to the National standards which relate to health aspects, we believe that EPA should develop and publish recommended limits relating to other constituents and characteristics which affect drinking water, such as taste, odor, and color. I would emphasize that these would be recommended limits as distinguished from the standards which specify mandatory limits. Such recommended limits are helpful as guidelines for States and localities to set out desirable characteristics for which they should strive for their public drinking water supplies even though a health risk is not involved.

4. The primary enforcement responsibility for drinking water standards, in our opinion, should lie with the States and localities. Federal authority to enforce the drinking water standards should come into play only if the States and local governments fail to act. Primary responsibility for assuring safe drinking water now rests with State and local government, and that is where we are convinced it should remain. The difficulties that we have identified with the National programs of drinking water do not stem from the present roles of respective levels of government but rather from inadequate coverage of enforceable Federal standards and from inadequate State and local programs. The solution of those problems would not, in our opinion, be effected by changing the roles of Federal or State governments in this area, but by assuring the enforcement of National standards and by strengthening State and local programs. In order for enforcement to be effective, a dual requirement should be included which would provide in cases where substantial adverse health risks are involved for immediate notification first, to State authorities and, through the States, to the

Administrator and second, to the users of the water supply system. Such notice should include the extent and nature and possible health effects of such noncompliance with National standards and the remedial measures which will be taken to correct the problem. Additionally, in cases where the State or locality fails to take prompt remedial action, the Administrator should have authority to institute administrative orders as appropriate to regulate uses of the water supplies in question, prohibit new connections, regulate the source of contamination or prohibit delivery of contaminated water.

5. Each water supply system authority should have to report regularly (at least annually) to the State agency regarding the quality of water delivered. The states should also have to report to the EPA annually regarding the quality of water delivered by each system in the State. Such a reporting system is important because it would provide continuing and pertinent information as to contaminant level and operation and maintenance procedures of the individual water supply.

6. States and localities should develop strong programs of surveillance, enforcement, technical assistance, training, and long-range planning. We see a Federal role in this regard directed toward the provision of research and technical assistance in those areas that are beyond the capabilities of the States.

7. Any drinking water legislation should clarify that the Administrator continue to be authorized to promote and conduct research into all aspects of water hygiene. We believe such research is necessary to provide the scientific data and methodology that will enable the Federal, State, and local entities involved in the supplying of drinking water to effectively perform their respective responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that many of these elements, which we consider necessary in any Federal drinking water legislation, are provided in Amendment 410 to S. 1478. However, we have difficulty with the following aspects of this Amendment. First, we do not believe that program grants as suggested in Section 302(m) are necessary or desirable. They would serve to help erode State responsibility and make State agencies dependent on Federal support. We believe that enforceable Federal standards, coupled with adequate monitoring requirements, will serve to stimulate improved local programs.

Second, we feel that the standards published pursuant to Section 302(a) of that Amendment should not apply to the "raw water source" or drinking water supply. In the same regard, the "National Water Hygiene Standards" of Section 302(b), which relate to various undesirable substances in "lakes, rivers, streams, bays, inlets, or other inland and coastal waters" are, in our view, an inappropriate requirement. These two provisions are duplicative of, and in possible conflict with, the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its Amendments now pending before the Congress. Under that Act, water quality standards have been established for various surface waters. Those standards specifically address water to be used as drinking water supply. Multiple inconsistent standards directed to the same end are not only unnecessary, they would in all likelihood thwart both the solution to the drinking water as well as the pollution problem.

We also have difficulty with Section 302(j) of Amendment 410 which would establish a "National Water Hygiene Advisory Council". We would prefer not to have such a body created by statute and feel that it would limit the administrative flexibility so necessary to properly perform our responsibilities.

I will now be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

ALL-VOLUNTEER MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago Congress made one of the most important commitments in its history—a commitment to provide our Nation with an all-volunteer military force.

That commitment was clearly evidenced in two ways. One, of course, was the pay boost voted for men and women in uniform. The increase—the largest ever voted by Congress—has raised military pay to a level on a par with the civilian sector.

But Congress second indicator was perhaps its most important one. Members of both Houses of Congress showed a clear reluctance to pass the draft extension bill. And when they did pass it, they made it plain that a majority did not intend to extend the draft again.

This fact was recognized—and clearly stated—only a few hours after passage of the draft extension bill last September 21 by Dr. Curtis W. Tarr, Director of the Selective Service System. Speaking at the Air Force Association's 25th Anniversary National Convention, Dr. Tarr said:

My speculation on this is that . . . we are moving in the direction of an all-volunteer force and that it is not likely that Congress, two years from now—if they have the same feeling that they have now—will re-enact the draft. I have talked to many a man in the Senate who has said, "Look, I am going to vote for you this time, but this is the last time."

The mood of Congress which Dr. Tarr elucidated has not changed, in my view. The commitment is just as strong and growing. And the progress which has been made in our transition from an army of draftees to one of volunteers has justified that commitment.

The volunteer army concept was met with a good deal of skepticism last fall. There are still skeptics today, but their numbers are dwindling.

Headlines in military newspapers in recent months are indicative of the progress which has been made. "Recruits Make DOD Happy," said the March 1 Air Force Times. The same paper on February 16 headlined a story, "Reserve Forces Gain Despite Zero Draft Quotas." Similarly encouraging headlines have appeared as well in the Army and Navy Times.

High ranking officials in the Defense Department and within the services have also been quoted as saying that an all-volunteer army is near. All too often, though, they have spoken of it as merely a possibility, something which we might achieve if everything goes right.

Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehke, in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on March 8, said this:

Whether a volunteer army is desirable and attainable is open for debate. I answer both questions in the affirmative but recognize there is room for an honest disagreement. I believe there is not room for disagreement on the program we have developed

to achieve a volunteer army. This program is a must whether or not the draft disappears.

I say this program is a must because the draft will disappear. We are going to have a volunteer army. It is going to happen, whether everything goes right or not. For this reason, it is imperative that we make every effort to insure that the transition is made as efficiently, as smoothly, as successfully as possible. If it is not, all of us will pay for the lack of preparation—both through increased defense budget demands and through a less effective defense force.

We cannot permit such a tragic thing to happen.

This is why I am taking this occasion to introduce legislation aimed at addressing areas of particular concern. I am pleased that the distinguished Congressmen SPARK MATSUNAGA, BOB WILSON, and CHARLES BENNETT have joined as sponsors.

Thus far, problems have been dealt with on a general basis—pay has been increased, efforts have been made to improve living and working standards within the military, some irritants have been removed.

But, what of specific problems? What can we do to encourage men to enlist or reenlist for special shortage skills? To convince health officials to join or stay in the military? To guarantee that our Reserves and National Guard will not be weakened in a nondraft environment?

The Honorable Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, told a Senate Armed Services Committee subcommittee that the use of incentives was being considered by the Defense Department.

Such incentives are the substance of the legislation which I am introducing. This bill, "The Uniformed Services Special Pay Act of 1972," addresses the areas which most need to be addressed.

Incentives included in the legislation are special enlistment pay, special Reserve Forces pay, special officer pay, and special reenlistment pay. These special pays have been grouped as a package because they represent the final new compensation programs which should be needed to attract young men and women into the military.

As I noted, general pay requirements have been met by the November 15 and January 1 pay increases. But we need special programs to insure that we are not faced with shortfalls in key areas during this transition period.

If we allow this to happen, it will not foredoom the volunteer army as a viable concept—rather, it will simply increase the cost of implementing it later. And money spent later to supply medical help, or lawyers or technicians, or Reserve Forces, is money taken away from programs such as housing or travel which can benefit all servicemen—careerists and Reserves alike.

The timeliness of this special pay package is unquestionable. These steps, if enacted soon, will provide sufficient time—more than a year until reliance on the draft is terminated—to replace the draftees and draft-motivated volunteers who are presently maintaining some specialized positions.

But, most importantly, the bill provides for accomplishing this in a cost-effective manner. Key features of this incentive system include: The ability to be turned on and off so as not to contain either a permanent cost or a wasteful period of termination costs; the ability to be applied directly at decision points, at enlistment and reenlistment; and the ability to be applied selectively to individuals and/or skills, without overpaying occupations for which needs are already being met.

The proposal is designed to apply to initial enlistment into the Active and Reserve Forces; initial entry into selective high-skill officer positions; and reenlistment into certain Active and Reserve occupations. This approach has the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. At our request, DOD staff members have assisted the intensive staff work that went into our preparation.

It is being introduced in the other body by Senators GORDON ALLOTT and ROBERT STAFFORD. The fiscal year 1973 budget for the Department of Defense has an allocation of \$376.4 million designed to fill the President's commitment to Senator ALLOTT for military pay raises.

The Senator has recognized, though, that there is greater need for this package of incentives than there is for another across-the-board raise. I share his feeling that the approach taken in this bill is the only one which will accomplish what must be accomplished before July 1, 1973.

The program here is designed to achieve everything the pay raise would have and substantially more—for less money. That it represents a savings of some \$177.7 million is an added dividend. Its projected cost is \$198.7 million, compared with the budgeted \$376.4 million. And the long-term savings are even greater. The pay increase would create self-perpetuating, ever-spiraling expenses. Our proposal not only saves money right now, but it will save countless additional millions which will be required if we do not make provisions for meeting these needs until they reach critical levels.

Many of the measures being implemented at the present time are designed with the same intent as this proposal—to spare us added expense later. Whatever the cost of improving barracks, hiring civilians for KP and other jobs, and upgrading the quality of food, the price must be considered cheap. For by making the military more attractive, we increase the likelihood of enlistment and reenlistment by thousands of young men and women. And with each reenlistment we save thousands of dollars that would otherwise be spent recruiting and training replacements for those who leave the military. This bill will provide incentives for men and women to enlist, but more importantly, it will provide incentives for them to stay in the military.

Already we are seeing dramatic indications that our transition to a volunteer military is scoring successes that even its most ardent supporters might not have expected. Lt. Gen. George Forsythe, Gen. William Westmoreland's special assistant for the modern volunteer

army, told a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee that enlistments in December 1971 were 20 percent higher than the number in the same month a year earlier. But of greater significance is the fact that 88 percent of these men were high school graduates and that the quality of the enlistees was up 80 percent, based on intelligence ratings. The general also said that the number of black enlistees has held at the 10- to 11-percent level. These statistics refute the old argument that an all-volunteer army might be a black army or an army of high school dropouts.

Assistant Secretary Kelley reported to the subcommittee that enlistments for combat arms have risen from 250 per month in 1970 to more than 3,000 per month in 1971 and 1972. And these overwhelming increases have been made without relying on the combat arms enlistment incentive pay which Congress authorized last year. Use of incentive pays, coupled with enlistment options and concerted recruiting efforts, should cause those totals to have another dramatic rise.

We have, as General Forsythe has said, gone the first 12 or 13 miles of a 20-mile hike. We have hiked that distance in a remarkably short time. We still have miles to go to reach our goal—but we know that goal will be met. What our incentives proposal provides is a means of making those last few miles a little easier and a lot less costly. And without this legislation, we may have to walk beyond that 20 miles before we can rest.

The volunteer army will be a reality—to a large extent it is already. Let us do all we can to make it as good an army as we possibly can.

EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATHIAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, California is an export State. The value of farm products exported during fiscal year 1971 was well over half a billion dollars—\$555.1 million.

Direct losses from the 1971 west coast dock strike approximated \$23.8 million to California agriculture. The costs of storage, spoilage, increased transportation due to diversion of commodities to alternate ports, loss of foreign markets, failure to meet contract obligations, dumping of export-bound produce on the domestic market—thus depressing prices for farmers across the Nation—and placing agriculture in a disadvantageous position as far as renegotiating contracts overseas is concerned are only a few of the factors which have battered California and American agriculture.

The loss of export markets alone due to the longshoremen's strike—markets developed over the past 10 to 20 years—cannot be estimated, but it could amount to billions of dollars and take years to rebuild.

Our farmers and the entire Nation need legislation that will prevent crippling national transportation strikes in

the future. We cannot afford another west coast dock strike.

The important thing to remember is that the losses that result from transportation strikes, like the dock strike, are not just figures to be looked at and then discarded. They represent the livelihood of people, more people by far than are responsible for the long, devastating work stoppages we have witnessed in recent years.

The refusal of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to report out an emergency strike bill was unfortunate. But we cannot let this temporary defeat halt our efforts to get responsible legislation enacted. We need a reasonable and orderly plan of action for settling these disputes and we cannot give up until we get it.

U.S. INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Middle East, crises come and go, governments rule and fall, but the problems persist. Most Americans think only occasionally of the Middle East, and when they do, it is usually in connection with strife and turmoil. Yet, through it all, the Middle East, an area where three continents join, remains important to us.

World leaders like President Nixon continually approach Middle East issues with either cautious optimism or reluctant pessimism but invariably with a warning that the Middle East is a dangerous area, a "powder keg." That caveat refers to the two central problems of the Middle East, and North Africa for the United States—the intentions of the Soviet Union in the area and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Most Americans can be forgiven if they do not fully understand why this vast area of sand and sea, populated by 100 million people, is of so much concern. The observations that follow are simply an effort to explain what U.S. interests are in this area.

Unlike Southeast Asia where many Americans have had increasing difficulty defining precisely our interests and objectives for the present, much less the future, the Middle East is an area where the United States has definite long- and short-run interests. Even so, it is probably an overstatement to say that the United States has many vital interests in the Middle East. The two interests there that can be labeled vital to America really transcend the area: First, we have an important interest in seeing that local conflicts and rivalries do not develop into major wars, perhaps involving the great powers; second, it is definitely in our interest that no outside power dominate the region.

The United States major asset in this respect are the Middle East States themselves. Although some alarm is expressed here about the increased presence and involvement of the Soviet Union in the

Arab world, the Arab countries are not about to give up their long-cherished and recently won independence.

While peace and stability are the overriding objectives of the United States in the Middle East, several nonvital, but nonetheless significant, interests combine to give the United States an important stake in what happens in this region between Europe, Asia, and Africa.

It is useful to consider these interests under four broad categories: strategic interests, economic interests, cultural interests, and the commitments derived from these interests. Although our cultural and economic interests in the area are significant, primary emphasis has been given to political and strategic considerations in the weighing of our policy alternatives in this region.

STRATEGIC INTERESTS

First. A primary strategic interest of the United States is to maintain the right of access to the area. The importance of our access to Middle East oil will be discussed below. The Middle East sits at the strategic crossroads of three continents with important links in those three continents, and the maintenance and development of lines of communication to and through the area is important. International waterways, air routes, and international communications networks crisscross the entire region and maintenance of access to these facilities is an important strategic interest of the United States. Without access, the United States would be a diminished power, unable to make itself felt in vast and critical areas of the globe.

Second. This strategic interest in maintaining access to the area requires a viable American military presence in case that access is threatened. Such a viability, however, does not automatically necessitate any permanent military presence. Our military missions in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Turkey, and Iran, our communications stations in Iran and Ethiopia, the 6th Fleet, and the small naval presence on Bahrain may come under increasing attack both here in the United States and in the Middle East, requiring the exploration of a variety of flexible, alternative means of maintaining military options in the area.

Third. The United States has a general interest in the political and social development of the entire area and all its peoples, and a particular interest in the preservation of friendly governments. The two only became incompatible when the governments we consider friendly are not committed to the emergence of a congenial and compatible world of free and interdependent nations or to political and social development. We ignore the 100 million people of the Middle East and North Africa at our own peril. Their development is in our interest and in the interest of peace throughout the region.

Fourth. A related American interest in the Middle East is to reduce Arab dependence on the Soviet Union and assure that no outside power dominates the area. While there is much disagreement over the means of carrying out this interest, there is no challenge to the validity of the objective.

It is important, however, to draw a distinction between the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to recognize each other's legitimate interests in the Middle East and the U.S. interest in denying the Soviet Union dominance in the area.

ECONOMIC INTERESTS

The United States also has significant economic interests in the Middle East today, and they will become even more important in the next decade. These interests—freedom of trade, access to Middle East oil, and freedom of oil transport—are prime economic considerations for the United States.

At present, American trade and investment in the Middle East and North Africa produce a net annual inflow of almost \$2 billion into the United States—no small contribution at a time when the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is greater than at any time since World War II. Oil is responsible for much of this and American oil companies have invested over \$4 billion in Middle East and North African oil ventures.

While given less publicity, the U.S. trade surplus in the Middle East and North Africa is, nonetheless, significant. In 1970, for example, this trade surplus was about \$1.4 billion. This figure becomes even more important when it is known that the worldwide U.S. trade surplus was \$2.69 billion. American products, technology and machinery continue to be popular throughout this vast area.

Although the present economic importance of Middle East oil for the United States must be seen largely in terms of its contribution to our balance of payments since less than 5 percent of U.S. consumption needs came from the Middle East, this is not likely to remain the case for long.

Though our need for Middle East oil and natural gas will never equal Japan and Western Europe's dependence on it for over three-fourths of their fuel needs, estimates indicate that by 1980, the United States may have to obtain a substantial percentage of its projected oil needs from the Middle East. The figures are staggering. The non-Communist world currently consumes about 40 million barrels of oil a day; the United States consumes about 18 million barrels of that. In 1980, it is estimated that the non-Communist world will consume between 80 and 100 million barrels and the United States 24 of that figure. At the present rate, the United States can get only 12 million barrels from domestic sources, including Alaska. Of the remaining 12 million barrels needed, about nine will have to come from the Middle East, and that figure will then represent between 35 and 40 percent of total U.S. consumption needs.

Without doubt, the economic importance of the Middle East for the United States is going to increase sharply in the near future.

CULTURAL INTERESTS

The United States also has many cultural assets and interests throughout the Middle East. Some represent a legacy of American missionary and philanthropic enterprises which have played a crucial role for decades in the prepara-

tion of Middle East elites. Robert College in Turkey, founded in 1863, the American University of Beirut, founded in 1866 and the American University in Cairo, founded in 1919, are three such institutions. Several newer educational institutions in Israel and elsewhere have also served to strengthen the cultural assets of the United States in the Middle East.

In particular, the Hadassah Hospital and the Weizmann Institute have helped strengthen and foster the natural ties between many Americans and the State of Israel.

More generally, the Middle East is recognized throughout the world as the cradle of civilization, the birthplace of the Judeo-Christian heritage and the preserver of the Greco-Roman tradition long after the Greek and Roman civilizations had faded into dark ages. The Holy Land in particular and the heritage nurtured in that land evokes for millions of Americans a cultural and religious bond that transcends nation-states and their difficulties. For Jews and Christians of this country peace and open borders in the Middle East, especially in Palestine, mean access to the origins of their faith, and they cannot conceive that the land where that faith was nurtured should be in a state of war.

Finally, numerous educational and cultural organizations in this country promote and preserve our cultural ties in the near and far reaches of the vast Middle East and North Africa area. The intensity of feeling in the United States for Israel and other countries in the region is only one manifestation of the strength of our cultural interests there.

RESULTING COMMITMENTS

All these interests can be seen most prominently in terms of U.S. legal and political commitments. These commitments are both formal and informal, unilateral, bilateral and multilateral. They can be considered under six broad headings:

1. MULTILATERAL COMMITMENTS

Both NATO and CENTO play important roles in the Middle East, and reflect U.S. interests in the Middle East. These commitments also create obligations for the United States in this area.

Turkey and Greece have participated in NATO since the early 1950's and they play a crucial role in NATO's security in the Eastern Mediterranean. Farther east, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and England are joined together in CENTO, with the United States serving in a non-signatory active role. This regional alliance promotes both defense coordination and economic cooperation in the span between the Bosphorus and the Hindu Kush.

2. BILATERAL COMMITMENTS AND OBLIGATIONS

We have few well-defined bilateral commitments in the Middle East. A vague obligation to Iran and other indigenous signatories of CENTO under a security agreement in 1959 can only be coupled with an even vaguer security agreement with Saudi Arabia.

We have an obligation to "consult" with the Iranian Government on appropriate measures, including the use of armed forces, if Iran is attacked. With

Saudi Arabia, a 1951 Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement formed the basis for a relationship, involving mainly military assistance, which has since been buttressed by a series of letters, some by American Presidents, reassuring the Saudi Arabian Government of our interest in its territorial integrity. Precisely what these obligations mean for the 1970's remains obscure.

3. MORAL AND POLITICAL COMMITMENT

The United States has a moral and political commitment to the defense of Israel which is assumed by both the U.S. Government and the Government of Israel but not defined anywhere precisely in writing. Below the government level, this interest in and commitment to Israel's well-being and security has special cultural, political, and moral overtones for many Americans.

Since 1948, successive Presidents and other high U.S. officials have reiterated, in less strong language, President Truman's statement of October 28, 1948, in which he stated:

It is my responsibility to see that our policy in Israel fits in with our foreign policy throughout the world; it is my desire to help build in Palestine a strong, prosperous free and independent democratic state. It must be large enough, free enough and strong enough to make its people self-supporting and secure.

Most Presidential statements have been more general. President Johnson, for instance, quoted John Kennedy on August 2, 1966, stating—

We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors . . . we strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East . . .

The security of friendly governments in the Middle East remains an important American interest in the Middle East today.

4. UNILATERAL POLICY STATEMENTS

Often, the United States has defined its commitments in special pronouncements. The Truman doctrine of March 1947, the Eisenhower doctrine of January 1957, and Johnson's five-point pronouncement in the Arab-Israeli conflict in June 1967 can be considered important declarations of U.S. intentions in this area.

Both the Truman doctrine and the Eisenhower doctrine pledged America's dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purposes. Both also state that the integrity and independence of the states in the region should be preserved. On June 19, 1967, President Johnson delineated five principles of peace: Every nation's right to live in peace; justice for all refugees; respect of maritime rights; end of the arms race; and respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states of the area. This unilateral policy statement has formed the basis for much of the United States peace efforts since 1967.

5. MULTILATERAL POLICY STATEMENTS

Two keys to U.S. policy in the Middle East since 1945 have had multinational backing. The 1950 tripartite declaration supporting the territorial status quo in the area and the U.N. Resolution 242 of

November 1967 are thought to be the most significant statements we have in the Middle East. From 1950 to 1967, the tripartite declaration was the most quoted statement by American Presidents on Middle East policy. Since 1967, the U.N. Resolution 242 has served the same purpose.

In the tripartite declaration, the United States, England, and France declared "their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area." They go on to state that if "any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines," they would "immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

The U.N. Resolution 242, passed unanimously by the Security Council in November 1967, had much broader international support, including that of the Soviet Union, and it has served as the basis of a search for a just and lasting peace between the parties to the dispute. It is not a commitment or obligation to take action, rather it gives international support to a peace in the Middle East, based on the provisions of the resolution.

The main provisions of this resolution recommended: "withdrawal of Israeli Armed Forces from the territories occupied in the recent conflict;" "termination of all claims or states of belligerency;" "freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;" "a just settlement of the refugee problem;" and "guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area."

G. UNILATERAL PLEDGES

The United States has also made a few unilateral pledges to specific countries at particular times. Such a pledge was made to Jordan in 1957 and to Saudi Arabia in the early 1960's. Each pledged American support for the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the countries.

CONCLUSION

The overextension of the U.S. political, military, and economic commitments abroad is causing increasing anxiety here at home. It is also causing politicians and policymakers to reevaluate U.S. interests everywhere in the world. From this process of reexamination, there will hopefully emerge a set of commitments in the 1970's and 1980's commensurate with our interests. Vietnam has served as a dramatic and painful catalyst in the questioning of every foreign commitment, military alliance, and economic and political tie. This review should properly include those in the Middle East.

As this brief statement is intended to convey, the United States has many politico-strategic, economic, and cultural interests throughout the entire Middle East area. The preservation of these interests depend on a strong commitment of the United States to peace and stability in the area and to a Middle East free from external domination.

It is precisely because war and the present situation of neither war nor peace threaten our interests that we seek a peace settlement of the Arab-

Israeli conflict. Peace and stability are the only way to assure our access to the Middle East, its peoples, and its economic and cultural resources. These interests must be uppermost in our minds as we shape policies for the years ahead.

PROJECT SANGUINE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I publicly released a report prepared by the Army Corps of Engineers on Project Sanguine that raises serious questions about the adverse environmental damage Project Sanguine may cause.

In its report, the Army Corps of Engineers terms parts of the Navy's draft environmental impact statement inconclusive and notes that the impact statement contains omissions and, in one instance, very little information on environmental questions.

What amazes me is the fact that the Corps of Engineers, which has been extremely unsympathetic to environmental control, should raise such serious doubts about Project Sanguine.

Specifically, the Corps of Engineers document states that power generated by Project Sanguine could "be high enough to be dangerous to a person" who touched an insulated wire which is grounded at a long distance. If an individual touched a particular insulated wire that was grounded at a long distance and which had the same potential energy as the electromagnetic field being projected by Project Sanguine, he would receive a shock.

The Corps of Engineers also points out that studies on the corrosion of underground pipeline is "inconclusive." Furthermore, the Navy has not estimated the cost of mitigating such corrosion.

The corps notes quite correctly that in its draft environmental impact statement the Navy dealt at length with the mitigation of telephone interference. However, little information was included on electrical ground potential that will require numerous devices to prevent telephone interference. Even the Navy's draft impact statement last year revealed that the cost of eliminating telephone interference may be as high as \$500 per customer—an unfair burden to be assumed by both Wisconsin's consumers and telephone companies.

Most of the tests on Project Sanguine have been conducted on cables above ground while Project Sanguine itself will consist of a series of buried underground cables. As a result the Corps of Engineers' predicts "some of the test results may be subject to question."

Unless all the serious environmental questions raised by the Corps of Engineers are satisfactorily answered in the Project Sanguine final impact statement scheduled for release April 7, that final statement will be inadequate.

The Corps of Engineers' report which I am releasing today is a comment on the Navy's draft environmental impact statement issued a year ago. The report is dated October 4, 1971.

As my colleagues know, the National

Environmental Policy Act requires that all Federal agencies submit a draft and eventually a final environmental impact statement to the Council on Environmental Quality that assesses the impact of any major Federal project on the human environment.

The Navy has informed me that the final environmental impact statement for Project Sanguine will be issued on April 7 despite the fact that it is based on only interim results. The Navy has requested that an additional \$450,000 in next year's budget for further environmental studies. If more funds are needed for environmental studies, how can the Navy possibly claim that its upcoming report is a final impact statement?

The Corps of Engineers in its reports says that all problems mentioned should be investigated and discussed in the final impact statement but the Corps assumes that eventually all the problems with Project Sanguine can be solved. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Navy must study Project Sanguine until it is absolutely clear that the building of the project will not adversely affect the environment of Wisconsin.

I have serious doubts that the impact statement scheduled to be issued April 7 will truly be a final impact statement conforming to the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Corps of Engineers report follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1971.

Commander W. K. HARTELL,
Project Sanguine Office, Naval Electronic
Systems Command Hdq., Washington,
D.C.

DEAR COMMANDER HARTELL: This letter responds to Admiral Crawford's request for comments of the Corps of Engineers on the draft environmental impact statement for Project Sanguine.

Recognizing that a final system design has not been developed and that final site selection has not as yet been made, the draft statement appears to contain adequate provision for further studies of environmental aspects of the proposed project.

There are no existing water resource projects of the Corps of Engineers located in the general area of Wisconsin and Michigan being considered as the site of project Sanguine, nor does it appear that there would be any conflicts with proposed or on-going Military Construction or Civil Works programs of the Corps.

Inclosed are technical comments concerning possible effects of the proposed low frequency ground currents on metal structures, communications relaying systems, hazardous electrical potentials and biological systems.

The opportunity afforded us to review your draft statement is appreciated, and it is hoped that those comments will be of assistance to you in perfecting the final environmental statement for project Sanguine.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. BARNES,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Executive
Director of Civil Works.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS—PROJECT SANGUINE—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. The study with respect to the effects of Project SANGUINE on corrosion of underground pipelines is inconclusive and the methods and cost of mitigation have been omitted. The effects of a-c ground currents on steel pipeline corrosion have been discussed but effects on lead sheaths for power and telephone lines or on buried aluminum culvert pipe were not included. Stray a-c currents have been shown to cause highly accelerated corrosion of lead and aluminum.

2. The antenna grounds will consist of buried bare copper ground mats probably made up of interconnecting cable and ground rods. The expected effects of galvanic corrosion between the copper grids and steel pipe, steel foundations, etc., in the grid area that have a low resistance connection to the grid should be discussed in the report. There have been many instances of rapid corrosion of underground piping and conduit systems located near buried copper ground mats if there are low resistance paths for current to flow between the copper and steel.

3. The effects of Project SANGUINE on telephone and power systems resulting from induced potentials have been discussed in considerable detail in the report but very little information has been included on the effects on these systems from the rise in ground potential from the flow of ground currents. On telephone circuits, in addition to neutralizing transformers for protection against induced voltages, insulating transformers, carbon block protectors, drain coils, protector tubes and similar devices may be required on some telephone circuits for protection from differences in ground potential. Differences in ground potential could also adversely affect power system ground fault protective relaying. An indication of current flow in grounded neutral connections is often used for ground fault detection. Neutral currents resulting from Project SANGUINE could require a reduction in relaying sensitivity.

4. The report indicates that step potentials will be very low; however, transferred potentials resulting from rise in ground potentials could be hazardous. The difference in potential between a point on the earth's surface near an antenna ground and some distant point could be high enough to be dangerous to a person standing at one location and touching a conductor grounded at the other location. Low conductivity (high resistivity) is desirable for transmission efficiency but undesirable from a potential gradient standpoint, as the potential gradients are proportional to earth resistivity.

5. The foregoing are considered to be possible problems and should be investigated and discussion, including proposed remedial action if required, included in the final report after completion of the detailed design. It is believed that all of the foregoing would be amenable to correction or mitigation.

6. It is noted that both the North Carolina and Wisconsin test facility antenna lines between the transmitter and antenna grounds were run overhead supported on utility poles. The report indicates, however, that these cables for Project SANGUINE will be insulated buried cables underground. For this reason some of the test results may be subject to question. In general, however, buried conductors would probably reduce interference effects. It is also unknown if burying these conductors would have any adverse biological effects, but it has been common practice in the past to use such cables for many years for power distribution systems without any noticeable biological effects.

HUCKLEBERRY FINN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I recently introduced. This is H.R. 13831, which calls for the Department of the Interior to undertake a study of the desirability of establishing a Huckleberry Finn National Recreation Area on the Mississippi

River. I propose that this recreation area begin at the mouth of the Missouri River at St. Louis and include all of the lower Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico.

In the opening lines of his book, "Life on the Mississippi," Mark Twain wrote:

The Mississippi is well worth reading about. It is not a common place river, but on the contrary is in all ways remarkable.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Twain. But, I would go further and say that the Mississippi River country is in all ways remarkable and well worth protecting and making its wonders available to visitors.

Nearly a century after Mark Twain penned his manuscript, Hodding Carter, in another book, expressed some of the feeling modern day residents of Mid-Continent America have for the river. In the opening lines of "Man and the River," Mr. Carter wrote of the Mississippi:

This river beside which I live is made up, think some of us, of the spirit and muscle of God; and, at times, of Satan's own sinews.

For us who know and live and fear and profit from and delight in it, the Mississippi gives reason for great pride—not just that of the people of a rich and powerful mainstream and its valley, but the pride of a man who has become the persistent tamer. For certainly in the history of mankind there is special place for such conflict between these protagonists, between man and the river, and for old tales and new of courage and brain and brawn, of men who live beside and deal with the torrent that is in perpetual motion.

This magnificent Mississippi River and its environs have played an integral part in this Nation's historical, cultural, commercial and recreational development. It can truly be said that this river, which practically runs the length of the Nation, is the thread which unifies the East and West of the United States.

In proposing the establishment of the Huckleberry Finn National Recreation Area, I have taken these aspects of the river's role into account. It is my intention that the unique opportunities for recreational, historical, cultural, educational, and natural qualities of this region be utilized and developed in harmony with wise commercial use of the inland waterways and streambanks.

My bill requires that in his study of the establishment of this recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior recognize that there are certain established private and public land uses which are compatible with the intent of my proposal. Among these would be, of course, hunting clubs, marinas, boat docks, fishing camps, camping and recreation areas, picnic grounds, wilderness areas bird sanctuaries, and game refuges.

The need for expanding the national park system is amply demonstrated, I believe, even in a brief look at the visitor pressures on the existing parks and acreage additions which have been made since 1950. Visitor pressures on the park system have grown tremendously. A major reason for that is the increased income many of the Nation's families have enjoyed and the rising amount of leisure time they have for exploring their homeland.

The number of visitors for all units of

the national park system, except the National Capital Parks, rose from 33.25 million in 1950 to 72.28 million in 1960. Yet, only 30,000 acres were added to the system during that decade. The number of visitors more than doubled between 1960 and December 1971—reaching 200.5 million persons. But, between 1962 and 1972, the gross acreage in the park system grew by less than 9 percent.

The National Park Service predicted early in 1971 that the number of visitors to all the national park system units, except the National Capital Parks, would rise to 256.4 million by 1980.

There is evidence of growing concern among National Park Service personnel and private conservation and recreation groups that visitor pressures are reaching a point where new restrictions on park use must be established.

Some of the suggestions which have been made include:

Prohibiting private vehicles of visitors from traveling in the parks and resorting to the use of public transportation within the parks;

Limiting the number of private cars entering a park on a given day;

Expanding the advance reservation system for overnight stays in the parks; and

Limiting visitors to the parks during seasons of intensive use.

Already the Park Service is being forced by visitor pressures to experiment with limiting the number of visitors to back-country areas of four parks. On March 1, Secretary of the Interior Morton said on a national television program that this experiment would be operated this year in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Sequoia National Park, King's Canyon National Park, and the Rocky Mountain National Park.

On the same day, the Secretary suggested that changes may be necessary to bring more control to the numbers of persons using campgrounds in the national parks. And, in a recent interview with the U.S. News & World Report, George Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service, indicated that expanded use of mass transportation, which was first experimented with in 1970, is being strongly considered. Limited service is already in operation in Yosemite and the Everglades National Parks.

In his 1971 environment message to the Congress, President Nixon supported the expansion of the Nation's recreation lands. Such an increase could help relieve the pressures on the national park system. That is another factor supporting the development of the Huckleberry National Recreation Area. In his message, the President said:

Merely acquiring land for open space and recreation is not enough. We must bring parks to where the people are so that everyone has access to a nearby recreation area.

That is what my proposal for Huckleberry Finn is intended to do. Combined with the proposal of our colleague, Congressman JOHN KYL of Iowa, for the upper Mississippi, we have the opportunity to provide a national recreation area that stretches from Lake Itasca in Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico. To do so, I believe

would give this Nation one of its most valuable additions to the national park system since the program was established.

During his service in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Frank Smith became a leading force in the effort to bring this Nation to a recognition of its responsibilities in this area. In his book, "The Politics of Conservation," Mr. Smith wrote:

The resource and conservation challenge for America during the final third of the Twentieth Century is not limited to water supply, recreation or pollution (of water, land or air). It involves new concepts of joint planning for urban growth, massive new transportation techniques, and total acceptance of the essentiality that all resource use and development is for the purpose of improving the environment and the life of the human resource. Is the American governmental machinery sufficiently flexible to respond to the challenge?

Through my bill, we, the Members of the Congress, have an opportunity to respond positively to the resource and conservation challenge. We must act now, before the National Park Service is forced into the position of posting a "no vacancy" sign before our parks—before we reach a "standing room only" situation which cheats park visitors out of the opportunity to freely enjoy the natural pageant which they have traveled many miles to enjoy—before visitor pressures on the recreation areas become so great that they spoil or destroy what we have meant to preserve while using.

For ourselves and future generations, we must act to insure the wise protection and maximum use of the historical, cultural, educational, recreational and natural qualities of the Mississippi River—this river which is so remarkable in all ways.

"CAMP FIRE GIRLS' WEEK" IN ALASKA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the valuable experience provided for America's young people by the Camp Fire Girls program, Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska has designated the week, March 19–25, 1972, as "Camp Fire Girls' Week" in the State of

Alaska. This proclamation underscores for the Alaskan people the noteworthy achievement of this program and its continued relevance in a changing epoch. It is my hope that a similar regard for the Camp Fire Girls excellent program be forthcoming in all the States of the Nation. I am pleased now to present the statement issued by Governor Egan:

PROCLAMATION—CAMP FIRE GIRLS

Camp Fire Girls commemorates its Founders Day on March 17, 1972, and celebrates its 62nd anniversary during Birthday Week, March 19–25, 1972.

Camp Fire is a vital and exciting program for young people. Through its recreational, camping, conservation, crafts, service, and other activities, it stresses a spirit of adventure, a sense of curiosity, and enjoyment of life to its fullest.

Camp Fire encourages each person to grow and learn in her or his individual way because it believes that each person is different and that these differences should be respected and enjoyed. Camp Fire emphasizes the need to give all people a chance to "do something" to influence decisions that affect their lives.

We need young people who will become thoughtful and concerned citizens and who are not afraid to act on their own beliefs. Camp Fire encourages independent and responsible attitudes in its girl members, its adult members and leaders, and its male high school age member who have recently joined the organization.

"Do something" is a fitting motto for Camp Fire's 62nd birthday. At a recent conference for high school age students, there was open discussion on issues like: conservation and ecology, drugs and escape, schools, prejudice, and political and social action.

Camp Fire is to be congratulated for its spirited "do something" attitude of social involvement and for its creative work with young people.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, do proclaim the week of March 19–25, 1972, to be Camp Fire Girls Week in Alaska. Dated this 6th day of March, 1972.

WILLIAM A. EGAN, Governor.

Lieutenant Governor.

BLACK LUNG STATISTICS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia, (Mr. KEE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I requested the Social Security Administration to report to me on the current status of black lung claims. These have been made available and reflect a re-

markable implementation of the Black Lung Act.

I am extremely proud to have been the original sponsor of this great legislation which has eased the economic burden of thousands of stricken miners, miners' widows, and other dependents. I had occasion to strengthen that legislation when it became apparent that a mere X-ray could not be conclusive proof of the existence or nonexistence of the disease. More detailed examinations under my criteria have resulted in many miners receiving compensation who would not have been diagnosed as black lung victims under a cursory examination.

Since the passage of this bill I have received over 20,000 letters from my coal mining constituents asking for assistance in processing their claims. This I have and am gladly doing for I feel that I am rendering a public service to the good people in my district. I am happy to report that during the past 2 years my office has processed in one phase or another on the average of 65 letters daily with an average of three approvals a day.

Within the Fourth District of West Virginia, newly formed from the old fourth and fifth districts, more than 14,700 claims have been approved covering 28,700 human beings—or nearly 60 percent of all persons in the entire State of West Virginia receiving benefits. More than \$61,440,000 have been paid these claimants between January 1970 and December 1971. Federal benefits have reached \$3 million per month in the fourth district.

Much has been accomplished, but much, much more remains to be done. Hundreds of appeals are pending on behalf of denied claims. Each and everyone has, and will continue to receive my personal and energetic attention. At this point I would like to submit all the data made available to me by the Social Security Administration.

CHART 1—BLACK LUNG STATISTICS

As of December 31, 1971	Claims allowed	Monthly payments	Total cumu- lative amount
Cabell.....	152	\$28,578	\$527,489
Logan.....	2,362	483,579	10,410,224
McDowell.....	3,090	629,969	13,732,967
Mercer.....	1,575	319,894	6,184,294
Mingo.....	1,713	364,611	7,599,089
Raleigh.....	3,887	764,973	16,377,341
Wayne.....	136	28,262	524,545
Wyoming.....	1,771	355,716	6,083,637
Total.....	14,686	2,973,582	61,439,586

CHART 2—BLACK LUNG STATISTICS

As of Dec. 31, 1971	National	Percent ¹	Pennsylvania	Percent ¹	Kentucky	Percent ¹	West Virginia	Percent ¹	West Virginia new 4th district	Percent ¹
Total filings.....	348,000		113,000		38,000		66,000			
Total processed.....	323,000		104,000		35,000		62,000			
Total allowances ²	160,000	50	70,000	67	11,000	31	28,000	45	14,700	53
Miners.....	88,000		38,000		6,000		17,000		10,000	
Widows.....	72,000		32,000		5,000		11,000		5,000	
Total current beneficiaries.....	240,000		95,000		20,000		49,000		28,700	
Miners.....	81,000		34,000		6,000		16,000		9,100	
Widows.....	69,000		31,000		5,000		11,000		5,600	
Dependents.....	90,000		30,000		9,000		22,000		14,000	
Total benefits paid, Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1971.....	\$532,610,000		\$228,401,000		\$41,370,000		\$103,895,000		\$61,440,000	
Total monthly benefits being paid.....	28,182,000		11,793,000		2,289,000		5,450,000		3,000,000	

¹ Percentage of allowances for total processed.

² Includes reconsideration and hearing benefits and benefits subsequently terminated due to death.

Note: The foregoing figures are estimates as of Dec. 31, 1971, by Social Security Administration and are rounded off to the nearest zero.

CHART 3—BLACK LUNG STATISTICS

1. Total Filings and Total Processed for New Fourth Congressional District were not available as of 12/31/71.
2. 14,700 to 28,000 West Virginia Total Allowances were in District.
3. 28,700 of 49,000 West Virginia Current Beneficiaries were in District.
4. \$61,440,000 of \$103,895,000 of West Virginia Total Benefits Paid were in District.
5. \$3,000,000 of \$5,450,000 West Virginia Total Monthly Benefits Being Paid were in the District.
6. West Virginia and District Denial estimates included itemization which consisted of counties outside the new Fourth Congressional District. For example, the Huntington District Social Security Office reported figures including Cabell, Lincoln, Mason and Wayne Counties—(1,265 denials); Bluefield Office (includes Mercer—2,063 denials); Logan Office (includes Logan and Mingo—5,798 denials); and Welch Office (includes McDowell and Wyoming Counties—5,170 denials).

PRISONER OF WAR RELEASE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I, joined by 30 Members of the House of Representatives, today introduced the Prisoner of War Release Act, which would bring an immediate end to the Indochina air war and within 30 days of enactment have all U.S. ground troops out of Indochina. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate today by Senators GRAVEL, Democrat of Alaska, and MONDALE, Democrat of Minnesota.

Last December 16, Air Force Secretary Robert C. Seamans, at a news conference, and in reference to the air war in Indochina, said:

No matter how you look at the air activity of the U.S. over there, the trend is definitely downward. . .

His comment was based on the average monthly bombing of 50,000 tons per month in Indochina for the months of July through November of 1971.

Since that optimistic appraisal of Secretary Seamans, President Nixon has dramatically escalated the air war.

In late December, while the Congress was in recess, the President ordered massive air strikes against North Vietnam, a total of 1,000 sorties over a 5-day period. This was in direct violation of the declared policy of the Congress that all U.S. military operations in Indochina be terminated at the earliest practicable date, as set forth in section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971, Public Law 92-156.

Subsequently, Department of Defense figures showed that, during February of 1972, 67,536 tons of bombs were dropped on all of Indochina, a 35-percent increase over the figures for the latter part of 1971 and higher than the monthly average for all of the last year.

Additionally, from January 1 through March 20 of 1972, there were 100 so-called protective reaction bombing raids against North Vietnam. This is five times the 20 strikes flown in the first 3 months of 1971 and will soon surpass the 108 strikes flown during all of 1971.

It is also five times the total number of 20 bombing raids against North Vietnam in all of 1970.

Other facts that point up the escalation of the air war include these:

Forty-two additional B-52's were added to those operating out of Thailand and Guam in February of 1972, thus doubling the B-52 force in the Southeast Asian theater.

In February of 1972, for the first time since November of 1970, three aircraft carriers were operating off Vietnam, with reports of a fourth heading in that direction. Each aircraft carrier carries 75 attack planes.

In January, in conjunction with the Indochina Education Council here in Washington, we sponsored a "counter-briefing" on U.S. policy in Indochina. Prof. Arthur Westing of Windham College, Vt., and Prof. Egbert Pfeiffer of the University of Montana described to the assembled audience the devastating ecological effects U.S. weaponry has had on the environment in Indochina.

Slides shown by the professors illustrated the enormous damage caused by just one 500-pound bomb dropped by a B-52 bomber, and the processors estimated that the bombing had already created some 23 million craters in Southeast Asia, each of them perhaps 30 to 40 feet across and about 20 to 25 feet deep. With the present acceleration of the air war, it is mind boggling to conceive of the scope of the permanent damage the United States is continuing to inflict on the Indochina environment.

Recent Harris polls, released in the Washington Post of March 13 and March 16 show beyond a doubt that the Vietnam war still remains a "very live issue" among the American people and that no more than 23 percent of the public feels that it is "close to an end." Additionally, by better than 2 to 1, Americans say they are opposed to leaving behind American bombers and planes piloted by the U.S. Air Force and Navy. If the media were only to faithfully report at least the monthly Department of Defense bombing figures, this majority of Americans would be better equipped to persuade their Senators and Representatives that they vote to end both ground and air wars as quickly as possible.

Today we are introducing legislation—identical to that proposed by Senators GRAVEL and MONDALE and being introduced in the Senate today—to swiftly bring an end to the conflict. Our bill, in effect, would bring an immediate end to the air war and within 30 days of enactment have all ground troops out of Indochina.

With a special effort on the part of the media and the public, those of us in the Congress who long for peace in Indochina hope to be successful in 1972 in bringing about the enactment of this bill.

The text of the legislation follows:

H.R. 14056

A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of United States military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. That subject to the provisions of Section 3 of this Act, no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended for longer than thirty days after the enactment of this Act to support the deployment of United States Armed Forces or any other military or paramilitary personnel under the control of the United States in or the conduct of military or paramilitary operations in or over the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

Sec. 2. (a) That no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended after the date of enactment of this Act to conduct off-shore naval bombardment of, or to bomb (including the use of napalm, other incendiary devices, or chemical agents), rocket, or otherwise attack by air, from any type aircraft, any target whatsoever within Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, or the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

(b) No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be expended after the date of enactment of this Act to conduct offshore naval bombardment of, or to bomb (including the use of napalm, other incendiary devices, or chemical agents), rocket, or otherwise attack by air, from any type aircraft, any target whatsoever within the Republic of Vietnam unless the President determines any such bombardment or air operation clearly to be necessary to provide for the immediate safety of United States Armed Forces during their withdrawal from the Republic of Vietnam, and submits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House for immediate transmission to the respective bodies of the Congress, within 48 hours of each such bombardment or operation (or if the Congress is not in session, as soon thereafter as it may return), a written report setting forth the time, place, nature, and reasons for conducting such bombardment or operation.

Sec. 3. (a) If, by twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and other adversary forces in Indochina holding American prisoners of war have not made arrangements for the release and repatriation, by the date in Section 1, of all such prisoners:

(1) the date in Section 1 shall be extended for thirty days, and

(2) the Congress may by joint resolution authorize such further action as is recommended by the President to secure the release and repatriation of American prisoners of war.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of the President to arrange asylum or other means of protection for individuals who might be physically endangered by the withdrawal of United States military or paramilitary personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, or to arrange for the return of United States equipment or stores from the Republic of Vietnam.

THE RUNAWAY YOUTH ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) in introducing the Runaway Youth Act. This bill provides for the establishment, maintenance and operation of temporary housing and counseling services for runaway youth to

facilitate their return to their families. It also provides for strengthening interstate reporting and services for parents of runaway children and for the development of research on the size of the runaway youth population.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, and is presently pending before the full Senate Judiciary Committee.

The basic purpose of this bill is to prevent juvenile delinquency. Its premise is that it is more effective and less expensive to prevent criminal activity by rehabilitating young people with minor problems now rather than to deal with them in the future after they are convicted for committing a serious crime.

Most runaways have committed no crime except running away from home, which is actually against the law of most States. However, because these people are young, inexperienced and alone, they face the substantial danger of having to commit crime to live. A runaway under 18 usually has no money and is unemployed. Since most are from suburban homes and run to our major cities, they are totally unprepared for survival.

Many drift into petty larceny like shoplifting. Selling drugs to buy food is also common. Many young girls have turned to prostitution rather than go home. Often the runaway experience provides a young person with his first initiation into the life of a criminal.

While I have been aware that the problem of runaway children has existed for sometime, I have only recently learned of the extent of its seriousness. The Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency recently held hearings which highlighted in detail this national problem.

From these hearings we have learned that nearly 1 million children run away each year and we provide almost no help for them. The police can do no more than arrest the runaway and send him home. However, this does nothing to solve the problems that caused the child to run away in the first place. Moreover, many of those who are arrested by the police are detained in juvenile institutions or in adult jails. There they are forced to associate with tougher juvenile delinquents and even adult criminals, often with damaging consequences.

Aside from prison and detention facilities, there are presently only a few underfunded, understaffed, but highly effective private programs providing temporary shelter care for runaways in several of our large cities. These programs provide the young people with an alternative to staying on the street. They contact the child's parents and give counseling to the young person so that he may better understand some of the problems that caused him to run away. The counselors in these programs bridge the gap between parent and child in an effort to make the return home as untraumatic as possible. These are the institutions which this bill proposes to assist and expand.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman and as

a father I am deeply concerned by the plight of young runaway children. The Runaway Youth Act provides an excellent means to provide the services which these troubled youths so desperately need. If we help these troubled young people now when they are runaways, we probably will never have to deal with most of them in the future—either as juvenile delinquents or as matured criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will give this proposal the prompt and favorable consideration which it merits. At this point I would like to insert the text of the Runaway Youth Act into the RECORD:

H.R. 14061

A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to meet the needs of runaway youths and facilitate their return to their families without resort to the law enforcement structure

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Runaway Youth Act".

SEC. 2. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 is amended by redesignating title IV (and cross references thereto) as title V, by redesignating sections 401 through 411 (and cross references thereto) as sections 501 through 511, respectively, and by inserting after title III the following new title:

"TITLE IV—RUNAWAY YOUTHS

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) the number of juveniles who leave and remain away from home without parental permission has increased to alarming proportions, creating a substantial law enforcement problem for the communities inundated, and significantly endangering the young people who are without resources and live on the street;

"(2) that the exact nature of the problem is not well defined because national statistics on the size and profile of the runaway youth population are not tabulated;

"(3) that many of these young people, because of their age and situation, are urgently in need of temporary shelter and counseling services;

"(4) that the problem of locating, detaining, and returning runaway children should not be the responsibility of already overburdened police departments and juvenile justice authorities; and

"(5) that in view of the interstate nature of the problem, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop an effective system of temporary care outside the law enforcement structure.

"AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and to provide technical assistance to localities and nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the provisions of this section beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1975. Grants under this section should be made for the purpose of developing local facilities to deal primarily with the immediate needs of runaways in a manner which is outside the law enforcement structure and juvenile justice system. The size of such grants should be determined by the number of runaway children in the community and the existing availability of services. Among applicants priority should be given to private organizations or institutions who have had past experience in dealing with runaways.

"(b) (1) To be eligible for assistance under this section, an applicant must propose to establish, strengthen, or fund an existing or proposed runaway house, a locally controlled facility providing temporary shelter, and counseling services to juveniles who have left home without the permission of their parents or guardians.

"(2) In order to qualify, an applicant must submit a plan to the Secretary meeting the following requirements and including the following information. Each house—

"(A) shall be located in an area which is demonstrably frequented by or easily reachable by runaway children;

"(B) shall have a maximum capacity of no more than twenty children, with a ratio of staff to children of sufficient proportion to insure adequate supervision and treatment;

"(C) shall develop an adequate plan for contacting the child's parents or relatives in accordance with the law of the State in which the runaway house is established and insuring his safe return according to the best interests of the child;

"(D) shall develop an adequate plan for insuring proper relations with law enforcement personnel, and the return of runaways from correctional institutions;

"(E) shall develop an adequate plan for aftercare counseling involving runaway children and their parents within the State in which the runaway house is located and assuring, as possible, that aftercare services will be provided to those children who are returned beyond the State in which the runaway house is located;

"(F) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the children and parents which it serves;

"(G) shall submit annual reports to the Secretary detailing how the house has been able to meet the goals of its plans and reporting the statistical summaries required in subsection (b) (2) (F);

"(H) shall demonstrate its ability to operate under accounting procedures and fiscal control devices as required by the Secretary; and

"(I) shall supply such other information as the Secretary reasonably deems necessary.

"(c) An application by a State, locality, or nonprofit private agency for a grant under this section may be approved by the Secretary only if it is consistent with the applicable provisions of this section and meets the requirements set forth in subsection (b). Priority shall be given to grants smaller than \$50,000.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny grants to nonprofit private agencies which are fully controlled by private boards or persons but which in other ways meet the requirements of this section and agree to be legally responsible for the operation of the runaway house. Nothing in this section shall give the Federal Government and its agencies control over the staffing and personnel decisions of facilities receiving Federal funds, except as the staffs of such facilities must meet the standards under this section.

"(e) The Secretary shall annually report to Congress on the status and accomplishments of the runaway houses which were funded with particular attention to—

"(1) their effectiveness in alleviating the problems of runaway youth;

"(2) their ability to reunite children with their families and in encouraging the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

"(3) their effectiveness in reducing drug abuse and undesirable conditions existing in areas which runaway youth frequent; and

"(4) their effectiveness in strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living situations for children.

"(f) As used in this section, the term 'State' shall include Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

"(g)(1) The Federal share for the construction of new facilities under this section shall be no more than 50 per centum. The Federal share for the acquisition and renovation of existing structures, the provision of counseling services, staff training, and the general costs of operations of such facility's budget for any fiscal year shall be 90 per centum. The non-Federal share may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

"(2) The Secretary shall pay to each applicant which has an application approved 90 per centum of the cost of such applications.

"(3) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(4) There is authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975 not to exceed \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

"INFORMATION AND STATISTICS"

"Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary shall gather information and carry out a comprehensive statistical survey defining the major characteristics of the runaway youth population and determining the areas of the country most affected. Such survey shall include, but not be limited to, the age, sex, socioeconomic background of runaway children, the places from which and to which children run, and the relationship between running away and other illegal behavior. The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than June 30, 1973.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out this section."

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HATTEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join with me in observing the 54th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. On March 15, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was born, and in spite of all the brave and heroic sacrifices by the people, the young Byelorussian state was unable to maintain its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces.

These are indeed brave people. During the years before World War I, Byelorussians pursued the cause of giving a national identity to their land. They continued despite Russian attempts to counteract their distinctness.

The first all-Byelorussian Congress met in Minsk on December 5, 1917. This Congress was attended by 1,872 delegates who were democratically chosen. They represented all Byelorussian political parties and organizations. After meeting for 12 days the Congress adopted a resolution endorsing the right of every nation to self-determination. They called for, in addition, the formation of a democratic government to be known as the Byelorussian National Government.

These people continued their fight for independence and on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic solemnly proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia and issued the following decree:

A year ago, the peoples of Belorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw

off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Belorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Belorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Belorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Belorussia with other states.

The dreams of these people are not fulfilled today. Their fine past has led to a tragic present. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was created in place of the Byelorussian National Republic. It is merely an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not represent the hopes of these people.

March 25 is celebrated by people of Byelorussian heritage throughout the free world as a symbol of their aspirations. I ask all of you to join with me in this observance and to work for the freedom of this land.

EQUITY DEMANDS EXPANDING HEALTH BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which would almost double immediately the Federal Government's share of health insurance payments for Federal employees and would provide for full coverage within the next 5 years.

Presently, the Federal Government pays 40 percent of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees. H.R. 12202, reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but not yet considered by the House, would increase the Federal share 35 percent over the next 5 years to a peak of 75 percent in 1976. This proposal, however, is far from adequate. I urge that the Congress increase the Federal share to 75 percent immediately and to 100 percent by 1976.

In the 91st Congress, we adopted a policy which promised that Federal employees would receive salary and benefits comparable to those enjoyed by their counterparts in private industry. An increasing number of firms in private enterprise pay the entire cost of employee health insurance. Fairness demands that the Federal Government do no less for its employees.

Furthermore, the cost of insurance for Federal employees has jumped in the past year. For example, last January, Blue Cross-Blue Shield premiums rose by almost 22 percent. Federal employees have been particularly hard hit by the skyrocketing costs of health insurance. The average civil servant with a salary of \$10,000, enrolled in a plan designed to provide good coverage, finds he must pay almost \$500 in annual premiums. At the same time, inflation has taken a serious toll on the scheduled pay increases for civil servants and the higher costs

of education and providing for a family make it extremely difficult for the conscientious Federal employee to make ends meet. In light of existing economic hardship and the basic equity which Federal law requires, I believe the House should speedily approve this increase for our civil servants.

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 54th anniversary of the day when the Byelorussian people proudly proclaimed their independence only to be overwhelmed by Bolshevik invaders.

In the year 1972 lovers of freedom among the Byelorussians just as proudly proclaim that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic established in place of independent Byelorussia is simply an administrative arm of the Soviet Union and does not truly represent the Byelorussian people.

I firmly and fervently believe in the right of national self-determination, Mr. Speaker. The only government worthy of the name is that which governs by consent of the governed. Let it be noted here and now that there has never been a free election in Byelorussia during the 54 years since it first was absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In their dedication to truth and freedom, Americans salute freedom-loving Byelorussians here and throughout the world on the 54th anniversary of their independence day. We share with them the hope that one day they will realize their national aspirations and retrieve the rights which are properly theirs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL, to extend the time of his special order on Tuesday, March 28, from 30 minutes to 1 hour.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HEINZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HEINZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ESCH, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIAS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BEGICH, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. KEE, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. DUNCAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DRINAN, for 10 minutes, March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HEINZ) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. KEITH.
Mr. HORTON in three instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. HILLIS.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. CONABLE.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON of New York.
Mr. GROSS in two instances.
Mr. BAKER in two instances.
Mr. TERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.
Mr. YATES.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.
Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. BOGGS.
Mr. BEGICH in three instances.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.
Mr. LEGGETT in three instances.
Mr. ROY.
Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.
Mr. REID.
Mr. WALDIE in six instances.
Mr. ASPIN in five instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.
Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.
Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.
Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1426. An act to establish the Van Buren Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3129. An act to authorize the estab-

lishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3166. An act to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 27, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1770. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to foster the development and implementation of an integrated system, to be privately owned and operated, for the prompt and accurate processing and settlement of securities transactions effected on national securities exchanges and in the over-the-counter markets, which will assist in assuring the proper functioning of the securities markets and which will be responsive on a nondiscriminatory basis to the needs of issuer companies, brokers, dealers, banks and other members of the securities industry and the public investors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board and the reports of several of the foreign-trade zones for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13435. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: House Resolution 913. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11896. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Rept. No. 92-945). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT (for himself and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):

H.R. 14046. A bill to provide credit for depletion in reduction of the accumulated earning tax base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14047. A bill to assure opportunities for employment to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, to provide job training and guidance when necessary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 14048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14049. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the weekend of September 15-17 as "God Day Weekend"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 14050. A bill to provide Federal health insurance for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 14051. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit noncommercial broadcast stations to deny, under certain circumstances, access to their facilities by candidates for Federal elective office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14052. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 14053. A bill to provide for the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California to hold court at Santa Ana, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, and Mr. GROSS):

H.R. 14054. A bill to repeal the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and to revive and reenact the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ABOWREK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 14055. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 14056. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 14057. A bill to provide greater assurance of Federal fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Government Operation.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 14058. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to require the National Railroad Passenger Corp. to provide free or reduced-rate transportation for certain railroad employees and their eligible dependents to the same extent such transportation was available to such employees and their dependents on the date of enactment of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14059. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the purchase of certain securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14060. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 14061. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to meet the needs of runaway youths and facilitate their return to their families without resort to the law enforcement structure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements in owner-occupied residential property and to eliminate the property depreciation allowance for certain non-owner-occupied rental property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 14063. A bill to protect the individual's right of privacy by prohibiting the sale or distribution of certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14064. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income and to coordinate it with the maximum yearly social security retirement benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 14065. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to authorize the Commission to issue temporary operating licenses for production and utilization facilities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 14066. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 14067. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 14068. A bill to establish regional Federal medical malpractice boards to reduce the expense of bringing, and the awards granted in, medical malpractice suits in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 14069. A bill to amend section 3401 of title 18, United States Code, to authorize U.S. magistrates to use the probation provision of the Youth Corrections Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 14070. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 14071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 14072. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the cost of necessary treatment, and to authorize project grants to increase the availability and effectiveness of such treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 14073. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949, to provide for adjustments in the support price of milk during its marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14074. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. PIKE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WARE, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 14076. A bill to amend titles 18 and 39 of the United States Code, to permit the mailing of lottery tickets and related matter, the broadcasting or televising of lottery information, and the transportation and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce, but only where the lottery is conducted by a State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14077. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from

the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 14078. A bill to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14079. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit adoption of more than two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 14080. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14081. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for repair or construction work on or about the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BRAY, Mr. DOW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H.R. 14082. A bill to abolish the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to repeal the authority for the extension of the west-central front of the U.S. Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H.R. 14083. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for the restoration or extension of the west-central front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 14084. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for the restoration or extension of the west-central front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 14085. A bill to provide a uniform date for the holding of all presidential primary elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 14086. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the withholding of compensation and retirement pay for certain veterans being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 14087. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14088. A bill to authorize a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to promote additional protection for the rights of participants in private pension plans, to establish minimum standards for vesting, to establish an insurance corporation within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 14090. A bill to use mortgage refinancing to help preserve low- and moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 14091. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 14092. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some

seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 1127. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the day of May 21 as "National Women in Education Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.J. Res. 1128. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 1129. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

343. The Speaker presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to federalization of the State welfare systems, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14093. A bill for the relief of Jose de Medeiros Moura and his wife, Maria Idalina Medeiros Moura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14094. A bill for the relief of Appalachian Regional Hospitals, Inc., and the Methodist Hospital of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, March 23, 1972

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning and for the promise that they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. Use us this day and every day in bringing to fulfillment Thy holy purposes for this Nation and the world. Direct us in our efforts that they may be spent in high endeavor for an order of justice and peace. Equip us with the graces of charity, kindness, and firmness in the right as Thou dost help us to see the right. Lead us as the shepherd of our souls into green pastures of divine truth and to the cool waters of spiritual renewal. Bring us at last to that abode of peace and rest of those whose lives are in accord with Thee.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 22, 1972, be disposed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF THE GULF ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE IN THE STATES OF FLORIDA AND MISSISSIPPI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 675, S. 3153.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3153) to amend the act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-680; Stat. 1967), an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the rec-

ognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof", strike out "\$17,774,000." and insert "\$17,774,000 (June 1970 prices)."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-680; 84 Stat. 1967), is amended by deleting from the second sentence of section 2(a), "one hundred thirty-five," and inserting in lieu thereof "four hundred," and by deleting from section 11, "\$3,120,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,462,000," and by deleting "\$14,779,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,774,000 (June 1970 prices)."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, S. 3153 is a sound piece of legislation and I urge its approval.

I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his usual fine performance in expediting consideration of this legislation. I also want to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Washington for his efforts on this important measure. S. 3153 would equip the Gulf Islands National Seashore to serve our people properly in the present. This is an important and necessary objective. Additionally, it would provide a headquarters for the seashore which would satisfy the splendid potential present in this undertaking for the Gulf Crescent and, indeed, for the United States.

My State has participated generously in this undertaking by making Magnolia State Park in its entirety available to the seashore. Enactment of this bill will increase the headquarters area from 135 acres to 400 acres. This additional acreage will provide us with a much improved visitor installation. Duplication of facili-

ties or services will be eliminated and visitor enjoyment of this attractive area would be much enhanced. Interpretive and visitor services will be made available, and school and youth groups can be properly accommodated on a year-round basis.

A right-of-way will be acquired and a 1-mile long access road will be constructed to U.S. Highway 90. Here we have a vital component for our headquarters—safe and easy access into and out of the park area for the countless thousands of Americans who will utilize and enjoy this national asset.

I submit that the very modest additional cost is fully justified by the advantages provided to the seashore, our people, and our country. I am pleased to note that the Department of the Interior has recommended enactment of S. 3153 and that the Office of Management and Budget has advised that it has no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program. In the interest of our citizens and in the furtherance of our mission to develop adequate park and recreational facilities, I urge the passage of S. 3153.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

(The remarks Mr. GRAVEL made at this point on the introduction of S. 3409 and the remarks of Mr. MONDALE are printed in the section of the RECORD devoted to the transaction of routine morning busi-